3 1761 11970134 0

AR3734



Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by

James Stewart, Esq.

Government
Publications

CA1 Z1
-55C21

Cage

Canada - Royal commission on broadcasting.
Hearings. v. 21-24, 1956.

1957


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/31761119701340

21

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

HALIFAX, N.S. JUNE 19, 1956

V. 21

I N D E X

SUBMISSIONS BY:		Page
THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE. Mrs. Nadine Archibald. Rev. J.D. Nelson McDonald.	...	3278
THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY. Mr. Alexander Laidlaw.	...	3292
RADIO STATION CJCH, HALIFAX. Mr. B.P. McCurdy. Mr. Finlay MacDonald.	...	3314
STATION CHNS, HALIFAX. Mr. G.J. Redmond. Mr. G.W. Dennis. Mr. G. McL. Daley.	...	3391
CANADIAN FEDERATION OF NEWMAN CLUBS. Mr. R.J. Flinn, Q.C.	...	3421

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
133	Brief submitted by the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture.	3278
134	Brief presented by St. Francis Xavier University - Extension Department.	3292
135	Brief submitted by Station CJCH, Halifax.	3314
136	Brief submitted by Radio Station CHNS, Halifax, N.S.	3395
137	Brief presented by Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs.	3421

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

The Sittings of the Commission commenced in Halifax, Nova Scotia, in the Red Chamber of the Legislative Building at 10.00 A.M. on Tuesday, June 19, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JOHN M. COYNE
	A.J. de GRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

SUBMISSIONS BY:

THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE.
Mrs. Nadine Archibald
Rev. J.D. Nelson McDonald.

THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT, ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY.
Mr. Alexander Laidlaw.

SUBMISSIONS BY:

RADIO STATION CJCH,HALIFAX.
Mr. B.P. McCurdy
Mr. Finlay MacDonald.

RADIO STATION CHNS, HALIFAX.
Mr. G.J. Redmond
Mr. G.W. Dennis
Mr. G. McL. Daley

CANADIAN FEDERATION OF NEWMAN CLUBS
Mr. R.J. Flinn, Q.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, Premier Hicks. Thank you for coming to see us.

PREMIER H.D. HICKS: Mr. Chairman, since you have given me the opportunity, I would like to welcome you to Nova Scotia in these completely non-controversial inquiries you are making across Canada, and to assure you that, insofar as we are concerned, we want to co-operate with you in any way we can. We have done that most significantly, I would say at the beginning, by permitting you in this inquiry to sit at probably the oldest conference table in this part of Canada, because you are seated at the table which was brought here in 1749 on the Beaufort Transport and around which Governor Cornwallis held his first meetings of Council in Nova Scotia.

I see you have a good representation from the broadcasting industry in Nova Scotia, and I am sure they will find a number of matters to bring to your attention but which, I am sure, will not give you any difficulty.

Welcome to Nova Scotia.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your kindness and your hospitality and for your most gracious reception. We are looking forward to our stay in Halifax and I see that we have a number of briefs here. We appreciate your coming.

PREMIER HICKS: Since you have ousted the Government from this place, I will now leave. I am sorry I am busy this morning because I would have liked to have stayed and heard some of the briefs, but

unfortunately I have some other problems to consider.

Good morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we are now beginning the hearings of the Commission at Halifax. I have already told the Premier how much we appreciate the arrangements in letting us have this room, and the table itself is an added value.

I do want, before we start the hearings, to put on record the regret of all three members of the Commission at the problem we encountered over the weekend in our attempt to hold hearings in Newfoundland. As perhaps you know, we flew all the way across to Newfoundland and could not go in at St. John's, and when we got to Gander they told us that the weather was very bad and we either might have been stuck there for several days or we had to return immediately. Rather than upset all the plans for these and the other hearings in the Maritimes, we decided we had better come back and pick up the plan here, even though all three members of the Commission were most regretful at not being able to be in St. John's, Newfoundland. We did consider whether we could go back there and consulted with those who were presenting the briefs, and they agreed with us that the considerable additional expense of going back a second time would not be justified in the circumstances but those briefs would be presented at other hearings of the Commission. One of these briefs in particular, that by Mr. Stirling of CJON in St. John's, will be presented at the hearings in Montreal early in

September, and the other two briefs may or may not be presented formally at other points where we will be meeting.

I do again say how much we regret the fact that we were not able to live up to our plans, through no fault of ours.

Now, a word about the procedure here for those of you presenting briefs.

We have a fairly informal method of procedure; the briefs are filed and read or summarized as the sponsors may wish, and then we have questions by our counsel and by ourselves. Those questions are designed solely to bring out the complete opinions and views of the witness and they are necessarily to some extent questions from, so to speak, the opposite side, but they do not indicate, and must not be taken to indicate, any opinions having been formed by the Commission. We do not intend to reach any conclusions until we have heard all the evidence, but by this method of question and answer in an informal, friendly way, we hope to be able to get the full picture of the problems we are to consider.

SUBMISSION OF THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

APPEARANCES:

Mrs. Nadine Archibald, Secretary-Treasurer.

Rev. J.D. Nelson McDonald.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief that we are to hear this morning, according to our schedule, is that of the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture and I understand that Mrs. Archibald, the Secretary-Treasurer of the organization, is here to present the brief.

Mrs. Archibald, will you introduce your associate?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I would like to introduce the Reverend J.D. Nelson McDonald. Although he is not directly associated with the Federation of Agriculture, he does have a very great interest in the welfare of rural people.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit 133.

EXHIBIT NO. 133: Brief submitted by the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, please?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: I would just like to add a word of welcome, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, to our Province. We sincerely regret you will not have the opportunity to visit some other points of the Province, and particularly to take a

drive through the rural areas, because at this particular time of the year they are very beautiful and we are quite proud of our rural areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, we will have a chance to see a little of it because I think we are driving to Charlottetown.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: No, that is fine. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a privilege we appreciate, the opportunity to present to your Commission the views of farm people in this Province, voiced through their own organization, the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture. We believe that not only has the service provided through the media of broadcasting and television been an important factor in the life of all our rural citizens, but also we can foresee it as having an even greater impact on the life of our nation as a whole in view of scientific, social and economic developments.

The character of our organizational set-up determines that the farmers of Nova Scotia advocate national unity as a source of strength and permanency, since they are a part of the National Farmers Organization, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. This Federation joins with other Federations of Agriculture across Canada in endorsing the policy regarding radio and television to be presented through the Canadian Federation of Agriculture to your Commissions. I think you will be hearing that brief when you hold your hearings in Ottawa.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is right.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Situated as we are geographically at one extremity of Canada, we cannot over-emphasize the necessity of a national system which will equalize opportunities for all Canadian citizens. Assisting in fulfilling this need, up to this time, the private radio stations in this Province have done their part well, and their efforts are appreciated in distributing programmes which are a part of our national system. Furthermore, in our opinion, the private stations in this Province have provided and, we hope, will continue to provide the services of a more local aspect which fit into the pattern of community or regional areas. This, we feel, is an important feature for the development and character of our local urban and rural society. However, we realize that not all areas are provided with this local service, and we must then look to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, whose policy it is to see that all areas of Canada are given as adequate coverage as possible.

The present system under which radio and television services are governed, and the policies which are implemented and reviewed from time to time, subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada, we consider are fundamental to the overall structure and planning for Canadian people, where we have such a wide diversification of interests. We suggest, therefore, that for such a system to continue and maintain this purpose of unity, the necessary finances should be provided by the people

of Canada, and administered through the sound guidance of one national board.

We suggest, therefore, that the Federal Treasury could also provide finances for the further development of a national educational system through radio and television, and thus provide for supplementary education which many rural areas are finding it difficult to provide, and for which many farmers are finding difficult to provide, in order to meet the educational needs of their families.

Farm people in this Province are grateful for the educational and informative programmes -- the news and market broadcasts, weather forecasts, public affairs broadcasts, and more especially the National Farm Radio Forum. Rural people have come to depend greatly on all these services, as an integral part of their welfare. We consider also that the manner in which these programmes are presented is a credit to any system, and we suggest this status can only be attained through possibilities for properly trained personnel, independent planning, and with a minimum of sensationalism.

I would just like to add that there is probably a need for more information on both tele-vision and radio in regard to consumer problems. Now, it is our feeling that this can be done only by the C.B.C. because the private radio stations are perhaps more interested in accepting all advertising which, perhaps, would have a tendency to exploit consumers, rather than give them information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you expand on that as to just what you mean by programmes with more information on consumer problems? I am not sure I get the ---

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Well, I think possibly the C.A.C. would be one organization that would be able to supply a great deal of information on research that they have done on consumer problems. That is, I am thinking of goods, but not entirely services.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean actual detailed discussion of the merits or demerits of different kinds of goods?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, different products. Then again, radio and television perhaps should be used more along educational lines, and here again we cannot expect the advertising sponsor, private radio, to take up the slack in regard to this. This is another case where the C.B.C. can be of service to the people and they can best supply it. I just wanted to add these few remarks if you feel there is any merit in them.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am very glad to hear you.

Do you wish to say anything at this time, Mr. McDonald?

MR. McDONALD: Only to say that we are very pleased, the farm folk, with Farm Radio Forum which has done so much for the people across Canada where rural groups are meeting week after week, hundreds of them, all across the country, and it opens their minds and I am sure it is a service that should not be discontinued.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the members of the Commission know what that is, but we have not really got it on the record of this Commission -- a statement as to how this works. Would you care to expand a little bit and explain what you mean by the Farm Radio Forum?

MR. McDONALD: Yes, I think I can say something about it.

For instance, on a Monday night there is a broadcast comes over at a certain hour on a problem that is acute to the farmers, like marketing or consumer needs or anything of that nature, or the value of certain phases of co-operatives; and after the broadcast then the farmers meet in a schoolhouse or in their homes and they discuss these problems, and that does a great deal to get them acquainted with their own problems and to do something about them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, is this method of discussion groups pretty widespread? Are there quite a number of farmers participating in little groups all over the Province?

MR. McDONALD: Oh yes, many of them.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: We had 132 groups in Nova Scotia last year and some of our largest attendance records were about 1200. We consider that is quite a good meeting when we get 1200 people out, and right across Canada we can say that it applies the same way except possibly that Nova Scotia has done more towards promoting Farm Forum with possibly the exception of Ontario -- I think they have more groups

because it is a larger Province -- but I think per capita-wise, we can see a greater increase and we feel it is one of the greatest instructions we have for our farm people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: These Farm programmes are on a national basis and yet we have a variety of climates and different conditions in various parts of the country. Are those programmes devised in such a way that they are of interest, real interest, to each part of the country?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, I think perhaps I can explain how these programmes are arrived at. Each year there is a conference, the National Farm Forum Conference, and from that conference they choose topics that are suggestions sent in by the Forum groups all across Canada, and they choose the most likely ones that would be suitable to a greater cross-section of Canadian people. When you speak of problems of farm people, I think perhaps there are no particular problems that do not apply to every farmer in Canada. I mean, we have production problems, we have marketing problems, and we have social problems as well, of course, but these apply to every farmer regardless of where they live in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we leave that subject of the Farm Forums, I can see a direct advantage to the group that is listening in terms of actual information. Would you care to say whether, in your observation, there has been also a growth of something you might call a national consciousness, national

understanding?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Very definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: A greater knowledge in Nova Scotia, say, of the situation in Ontario and the Prairies and so forth?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, it has a tendency to unify the Canadian farmers, and I think that is borne out by the fact that the Canadian Federation is a co-sponsor of the Farm Forum along with the Association on Adult Education and the C.B.C.

MR. McDONALD: I just want to add one word. Mrs. Archibald was speaking of organized groups but, of course, there are unorganized groups which are just as important where two or three people meet together, and not only in the rural areas, but it is a fact in the urban areas too -- sometimes there is an interested group. There are some problems which are akin to both those in the urban and rural areas, and they are all listening to this programme, which is just as important to the people in the city as in the country. I was going to add that the Country Calendar is another one on Sunday afternoons; I think it is changed now to an hour that is not quite as popular -- and it is a great thing, the market reports and weather and so on is of great service to the people and I think it should be continued.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, have you some questions?

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Archibald, in connection with television,

could you tell us whether the existing television stations pretty well cover the rural areas of Nova Scotia, or are there still substantial areas in the rural part of the Province where they are not able to receive television signals?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Very definitely there are rural areas that cannot receive television.

MR. COYNE: Is it possible to indicate in general terms which areas can receive television and which cannot at the present time?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Well, I think possibly through the western area it is very good because they can get either Saint John or possibly Halifax. I think perhaps down what we call the South Shore, that is Southwestern Nova Scotia, the coverage is not quite so good; and then possibly in some parts of Eastern Nova Scotia, that is down in Antigonish County, but we would hope in these areas when Charlottetown has the television station going that they will be able to cover some areas that just do not get television at all.

MR. COYNE: At the present time I believe there are stations at Halifax, Sydney, and also at Moncton and Saint John in New Brunswick?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, and one, I believe, to be opened this Fall in Charlottetown.

MR. COYNE: Is the position of the Nova Scotia Federation of Agriculture generally that you support the present structure of broadcasting in Canada?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes.

MR. COYNE: With the C.B.C. providing a national service and private stations providing local service and acting as outlets in certain areas for the national service?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

MR. COYNE: And you are not recommending any changes in the basic structure?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: We are not recommending any separate regulatory board.

MR. COYNE: Or any other changes in the present structure?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: No.

MR. COYNE: Just one point arising out of your brief: On page 2, the second last paragraph, you say:

"We suggest, therefore, that the
"Federal Treasury could also provide
"finances for the further development of
"a national educational system through
"radio and television, and thus provide
"for supplementary education which many
"rural areas are finding it difficult
"to provide ..."

Would you expand a little on what you have in mind there respecting the further development of a national educational system through radio and television?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Well, I think what we had in mind there, Mr. Chairman, was one of the difficulties that we -- that our people have experienced

and you know that there is a great migration of population from Nova Scotia to Ontario, it is going on all the time, and our systems of education are entirely different, and there are always those difficulties for families to adjust themselves to various educational systems within the province. We feel that some national educational system through the means of radio or television -- that these barriers may be overcome to a great extent; and we also think that it would have the same effect as we discussed in relation to the farmers in having a greater unity in thinking.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may, of course, make it easier to increase this export that you always regret -- I am only joking.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Well, that is one of our greatest exports. We say the brains of Nova Scotia are all exported. But, nevertheless, we feel that with the potentialities that we have in this Province and a greater diversification of educational mediums that we could ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps the idea behind Mr. Coyne's question was really as to the exact meaning that you attached to the word "education"?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Well, I mean strictly academic education.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are not thinking of formal courses or anything like that?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: No, it is a matter of instruction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of enlightenment?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: We do at the present time have some educational broadcasts, and they are very helpful, particularly to our rural schools, because they are getting information there that it is just impossible for rural schools to get otherwise.

MR. COYNE: You are speaking of the School broadcasts?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you happen to know whether the School broadcasts are worked out in c ollaboration with the Provincial Department of Education?

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just had one general question which you might be able to help us on. I think you have answered most of it already in the various answers we have had so far. One of the problems we are faced with in reaching any conclusions is the degree to which actual use is being made of the -- you may call them the more cultural, more serious programmes of the C.B.C., not the pure entertainment programmes, the type of programme you need to do a little work on. Are they, in fact, being listened to or viewed? We have had a conflict of evidence and some people are inclined to say, "Well, nobody listens to those programmes", and other people seem to indicate that they do. Now, can you give us any idea as to that?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: We certainly appreciate

the problems that the Broadcasting Corporation has in supplying the needs of all people of Canada, but I think by and large they do provide a very good type of programme. I think we have mentioned that in our brief, that it is a credit to any system. We feel, perhaps I cannot say this from an organizational viewpoint because it is something we have never discussed -- but, personally, I feel that the programmes that are presented by the C.B.C., there is a good enough variety to supply the tastes of all the citizens of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Archibald, that is a valuable opinion for us to have, but it is not quite my question. It is good for us to know ---

MRS. ARCHIBALD: You want to know are they listening?

MR. McDONALD: Any specific ones in particular?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am really thinking to some extent of some of the very ones we have been discussing -- the Farm Forums ---

MR. McDONALD: Citizens' Forum and Fighting Words?

THE CHAIRMAN: Debates and panel discussions.

MR. McDONALD: Oh, most interesting.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Is there a wide listening audience in the rural communities?

MR. McDONALD: Oh, definitely.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: If they were set

up in competition with some light entertainment from some other station ---

MR. McDONALD: I think you get more attention to the heavier programmes from the rural people. I am not saying the people in the cities are more light-minded, but the rural people want something more than ballet and that sort of thing.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: It depends on the time the programmes are on because rural people usually just have the evenings to listen to radio and watch television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, going from the discussion-type of programme to what comes under the general heading of more serious music or drama, what about those?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: I think perhaps most country people do like the lighter classical music rather than operas and so on. I think that is true, not that they are lacking in any appreciation of music, but it is their natural folklore that leads them towards that kind of music and possibly drama as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about plays?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, I think plays are very popular.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even some of the more classical-type of play?

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the things I have asked about before is the production of Macbeth.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, very well done.

MR. McDONALD: They are very, very acceptable; it may be a little difficult for them to read, but when they see it they really focus their minds on it and they talk about it for days. I know that for a fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those were the only questions I had. I appreciate your coming and preparing the brief and presenting it in this way.

Thank you, Mr. McDonald, for coming also.

MRS. ARCHIBALD: Yes, my moral support.

SUBMISSION OF THE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT, ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. Alexander Laidlaw, Associate Director.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are to hear is that of the St. Francis Xavier University, to be presented by Mr. Alexander Laidlaw.

Mr. Laidlaw, we are very glad to have you here; do sit down and we will start by marking your brief as Exhibit 134.

EXHIBIT NO. 134: Brief presented by St. Francis Xavier University.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed with the presentation of the brief as you see fit?

MR. LAIDLAW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If you gentlemen do not mind, I would prefer to stand. I taught school for many years and I am always more at home standing up.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like, rather than reading the brief, to run through it and comment on the various paragraphs, and in that way give you a sort of summary.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be quite satisfactory.

MR. LAIDLAW: I should like to thank the Commission for this opportunity of appearing on behalf of our Extension Department. I should like to say at the outset that while I am presenting this on behalf of the Extension Department, this brief represents the combined thinking of the senior -- five or so -- senior members of our staff.

In the second paragraph I say something about our Department: the Extension Department of our University was set up about 27 years ago. We work in one way or another with practically all classes of people, but our work is mainly with fishermen, farmers, industrial workers, coal miners, steel workers and so on. May I add to that paragraph that we ourselves use radio to a considerable extent in our educational work. We have a number of educational programmes that we have been running now for -- one has been running for over 10 years. In each case we broadcast them over our local station, that is a privately-owned station, CJFX.

In the third paragraph I emphasize the fact that our viewpoint here is education. We realize that there are tremendous technical and financial problems connected with radio and television, but we are concerned with the educational aspect of the question. We believe, and our experience in this field substantiates that -- we believe that radio can be a very great means of education which can be used effectively, and we think we have done so both with rural and urban people. It is no exaggeration to state that radio and television have a major role to play in moulding the well-informed and enlightened Canadian nation that we trust will inhabit this land of ours in days to come.

In the next paragraph we emphasize the fact that radio, being so important as an educational medium, it should be guarded, it should be kept as a great public trust. It follows that broadcasting must be developed as a public trust for the benefit of all the people.

In paragraph 6 I tried to bring out the fact that there is a great job in enlightening the Canadian nation that can very well be done by radio and television, the field of citizenship, the understanding of our Canadian way of life, the interpretation of the cultural pattern of the Canadian nation.

In the next paragraph I bring out the fact that a great number of our private stations do give us educational programmes and they are providing a valuable community service, but it is our belief that

it is to the national system, the publicly-owned side of the radio industry, that we have to look for the great majority of the broadcasts which we would label educational and, shall we say, the publicly-owned part of our national system is the part that should be maintained, strengthened and provided with adequate funds to do the task well.

Paragraph 8 is very much the same as Mrs. Archibald's statement in which we would like to see that all the people get good radio and television service. I am sure that point has been brought out many times across Canada.

In paragraph 9, I think this is the crux of our presentation, we favour the present system of broadcasting in Canada. We favour the system in which the public stations of the C.B.C. are what we might call the dominant part of the system and the private stations provide supplementary service to the publicly-owned system.

In paragraph 10 we touch upon the question of regulation. We believe the C.B.C. should have full authority and regulatory power over all radio and television in this country.

Now, in paragraph 11 we go a little further with the statements in paragraph 10, and I would like to emphasize that, while we want to support the present system of broadcasting in Canada, we certainly do not endorse all the programmes or all the broadcasts that are provided by the C.B.C. We do not endorse them; moreover, we insist that private stations

are providing a valuable supplementary service. May I emphasize the statement at the end of paragraph 11, that we would like to see regional advisory committees set up across Canada to act voluntarily with the Board of Governors in determining broadcasting policies and programmes.

Finally, the last paragraph refers to the financial aspect -- who is going to pay for the job, the work of broadcasting, and our answer is that it should be paid out of public funds the same as any other essential public service.

That is all, Mr. Chairman; since you have the brief I do not think there is any need of adding anything further.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Laidlaw.

Mr. Coyne, have you any questions?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

In your supplementary remarks you refer to the use which your Department is and has been making of radio in regard to the extension work and you refer to disseminating these programmes over CJFX. Is that a local station in Antigonish?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

MR. COYNE: It has no connection with the University as such?

MR. LAIDLAW: No, CJFX is owned by a company called the Atlantic Broadcasters Limited, and the shareholders are citizens who have bought the stock of CJFX, largely in Eastern Nova Scotia. May I say, by the way, that our distribution of stock

in CJFX is controlled, as it were, to this extent: that no one person has more than five shares and the Board of Directors also distributes the stock so that all areas served by the station are represented in the ownership of the company.

MR. COYNE: Would you say that is, in a sense, a co-operative venture rather than a normal commercial-type of business operation?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes, it is partly co-operative to the extent that the control is dispersed.

MR. COYNE: Does it try to make a profit?

MR. LAIDLAW: It not only tries, it has to make a profit to stay in business.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the actual acquisition of shares was actually based with some content of public service in it?

MR. LAIDLAW: Oh yes, that was the thinking behind the establishment of the station -- that it would provide a more intimate community service, as it were, and it does in such things as the March of Dimes and in relation to purely educational work the station provides very, very valuable community services.

MR. COYNE: In your arrangements with the station for the broadcast of your Extension Department programmes, do they provide time free to your Department?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes. In all our broadcast work, our educational programmes, we try to set up the advisory services under three or four branches in

this way, for instance, our urban programme called "The Peoples' School", we have an advisory board of trade unionists and people in the industry plus our Department plus the radio station. In the case of our rural programmes we use men of the Department of Agriculture, farmers organizations like the one represented by Mrs. Archibald, our Department and, again, the station.

MR. COYNE: Are your programmes broadcast over other stations than CJFX? Do you have any network for your programmes?

MR. LAIDLAW: Not a network, but we have an exchange service whereby our tapes are given to other stations and a number of -- I am not exactly sure, broadcasting and radio is not my particular field, we have a Director of that; I am not sure of the number of stations that use our tapes, but I do know that a number of stations in the Maritimes use our tapes on, say, two or three nights following the actual broadcast.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the general aspect of your brief, particularly the early part, you tend to suggest on the top of page 2 that the aspects of broadcast other than education have perhaps been over-emphasized. Do you think it is also possible to over-emphasize the educational aspect of radio and T.V. to the detriment of the entertainment aspect?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, I think we could increase the educational portion of our radio for a

long time before it would be weighted either way.

MR. COYNE: It is a question of balance, is it not?

MR. LAIDLAW: Of course.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree that particularly television performs a very significant entertainment function?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes. May I say that T.V. reception in our area is very, very poor; we only get stations occasionally, or reception occasionally, and so I am not qualified to speak much on T.V. The only time I see T.V. is when I am travelling somewhere else.

MR. COYNE: What do you mean by educational broadcasts? You use the phrase several times; could you give us any more specific terms what you regard as an educational broadcast?

MR. LAIDLAW: It is not easy to define because, I suppose, all broadcasting in one way or another is education of one kind or another, but there are certain programmes that are definitely aimed at instruction, information and so on. You spent some time this morning discussing, for instance, the National Farm Radio Forum; that is definitely an educational broadcast, it is aimed at disseminating information. Citizens' Forums, that is educational. In our work we have two broadcasts, one that is aimed at rural people for their benefit, is instruction in agriculture; then we have the field of school broadcasting, which is strictly, I suppose,

educational. Then there are a number of informational broadcasts like -- well, we have in the Maritimes such a programme as "Maritime Gardener", a programme I listen to myself, and that is educational.

MR. COYNE: You are thinking of instructional and informational programmes rather than programmes which may have an incidental educational effect along with entertainment?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes, it is, I suppose, if we consider it on a scale from the certain broadcasts that are specific and definitely educational. On the other hand, there are broadcasts that we cannot consider educational at all, and in between there are a great number of programmes that are educational in nature but are not specifically in the field of education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where would you class, for instance, the example I used with Mrs. Archibald, Macbeth? After all, it is a play but it is also on the curriculum of quite a number of schools and it must have some educational value.

MR. LAIDLAW: Of course that would be educational. It is very, very difficult to draw the line.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure a rigid line has to be drawn; it is more a question of emphasis and balance.

MR. COYNE: As you say at the outset, you are approaching this from the point of view of an adult educator.

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to one or two specific points in your brief: First of all, paragraph 7 in the middle of page 3 you make this statement, which perhaps I am taking out of its context:

"Business corporations provide educational "programmes only from the profits made "from various products advertised on the "airwaves; education in this way comes "to us only as the crumbs that fall "from the lavish table of the business "world."

My question is this: In your mind is there any objection to the source of funds for educational purposes provided the funds are available?

MR. LAIDLAW: No, there is no objection, but I would prefer to see the funds coming directly from public funds, as it were, so that the people know what they are paying for.

MR. COYNE: Do you have any objection in principle to the commercial sponsorship of educational programmes? One of the great problems in this sphere seems to be finances.

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And is there any reason why, provided sponsors can be found, why there should not be commercial sponsorship of educational programmes, in your view?

MR. LAIDLAW: No, I do not think we should object too strongly to it, but I would prefer to see

the funds for educational programmes come from the public funds rather than from business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that item, I take from what you say that if a programme was a good educational programme, it would not matter to you if they were able to attract a commercial sponsor in pinciple, even though you would prefer to have it come from public funds?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any thought at all behind what you say here -- that while the individual programme might be sponsored by a commercial company, that the question of general sponsorship of educational programmes might change the overall programme pattern to some extent; is that behind your thinking here at all?

MR. LAIDLAW: If I might expand the thinking behind it or the thought I had in mind: I would not want to have educational broadcasting dependent on the funds that it might or might not receive from business profits. I think that educational broadcasting has to depend on a more solid, continuous and dependable source of income.

MR. COYNE: Well then, Mr. Laidlaw, turning to page 4, paragraph 9, in which you say:

"We favour the present system of broadcasting "in Canada."

And a little further down:

"This combination of public and private "ownership gives the Canadian people the

"fruits of both systems."

I wanted to ask you whether you or your department have any views, or have given consideration to the question of promoting private networks? We have had some representations that private stations should be more free than they are now to form networks among themselves; do you have any views or opinions to offer on that question?

MR. LAIDLAW: No; actually I have not.

MR. COYNE: In one way or the other?

MR. LAIDLAW: I do know that we have found this exchange of tapes, for instance, very valuable. Now, if you could hook up on the stations for the actual broadcast rather than waiting for the distribution of tapes, if that is what you mean?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is one way.

MR. LAIDLAW: No, I do not think we would voice an opinion one way or the other on that.

MR. COYNE: Well then, in paragraph 10 on page 5 you comment on the proposition of a separate regulatory body which you disapprove of, and then you say:

"To put the C.B.C. under the control of
"any body other than the Parliament of
"Canada would have the effect of estab-
"lishing two broadcasting systems in
"this country, and we fear that the end
"result would be the destruction of
"our publicly-owned system and the de-
"cline of Canadian broadcasting."

Could you expand at all on the reasons why you go that far -- that the end result would be the destruction of our system and decline of Canadian broadcasting?

MR. LAIDLAW: It is based on this thinking: Let us suppose we have a Canadian body regulating a public broadcasting system on one hand and private stations on the other; then before that independent body two systems are equal, as it were, the C.B.C. and the private stations. The C.B.C. would have to depend for its funds on grants from Government; the other stations can live on the profits of their stations. In time of stress probably the C.B.C. would be denied the funds to carry on, whereas the other, the private stations, will have the funds that they can make out of the system, and I am afraid then that the C.B.C. would not have the funds necessary to carry on and it would be relegated to a secondary position.

MR. COYNE: Your point of view is, if I understand it correctly, that the national service should be the dominating factor in a single system?

MR. LAIDLAW: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Is that a reasonable summary of your point of view?

MR. LAIDLAW: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Then, at the bottom of the page you suggest:

"... that regional advisory committees

"be set up across Canada to act

"voluntarily with the Board of Governors
"in determining broadcasting policies
"and programmes."

I wonder if you could expand a little on what you have in mind here as to the constitution and functioning of these regional advisory committees?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, the purpose of these committees, of course, would be to get a cross-section of opinion from all groups so that we would be sure that various segments of the Canadian people would be represented in the formulating of broadcasting policy. In the Maritimes, for instance, if you consider that one region, I think it would be quite easy to have an advisory body of, I would not suggest how many, but suppose you had an advisory body of eight or ten; it could probably represent the private stations, it could represent the business groups and the unionists; farmers, fishermen, university people; and it would be quite easy in each case, I think, because you have a sponsoring organization that could elect representatives.

For instance, we have the Trade Union Federation, we have the Federation of Agriculture, we have such an organization as the Nova Scotia Teachers Union; and all of those, I think, could be invited or asked to appoint representatives to such a body, and in that way you would have a cross-section of the population taking an active part in the formulating of policy.

MR. COYNE: At the regional level?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Well then, one final question: Your paragraph 12 on page 6, you are dealing with the matter of financing the service and you say:

"If we are a mature and reasonable
"people we shall pay for the services
"we want by voting through Parliament
"the necessary moneys to support the
"C.B.C. The public purse provides
"funds for other educational services;
"it should do likewise for education
"by radio and television."

Now, you say the public purse provides funds for other educational services, but surely the public purse does not provide funds as a general principle for public entertainment? Is there really a valid analogy between the financing of the educational services in the Province and financing of radio and television when radio and television is, to a large extent, public entertainment rather than education?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, first of all, going back to my first statement, I think there should be more educational broadcasting. There can be more and there would be more if there were larger funds available for it.

MR. COYNE: Have you given any thought to the idea that perhaps the burden of supporting the entertainment functions could be, in part, diverted to commercial shows? You are thinking primarily of education, but, of course, the C.B.C. is an organi-

zation which deals with all sorts of things, including entertainment. Now, do you support the proposition that the C.B.C. in all its aspects should be supported by public funds?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, pure entertainment, again it is so difficult to draw the line; we would not know where to stop. The idea I had there, of course, was, we first recognize that radio and television are great media of education, and once we recognize that then we make the funds available to do the job that we have to do. I do not know if I am answering your question?

MR. COYNE: I think you are. I think it may be possible to read into your statement that you were thinking that the public purse should support the strictly educational parts of the service, but not necessarily the entertainment ones. I take it that is what you are suggesting?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, on this question I would like to put to you the point that was given us when we were in Vancouver by another university man, Dean Andrew of the University of British Columbia. He was putting somewhat the same point, but I think he was putting it on a slightly different basis. Rather than confining it to education, his point was that this was, despite our hesitation to use the word, a medium of Canadian culture. And then he proceeded to define the meaning of Canadian culture and he did that by saying that Barbara Ann Scott and Rocket Richard were equally part of Canadian culture along

with Lorne Harris and Sir Ernest MacMillan. In other words, the whole content of Canadian life was part of Canadian culture.

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that this should form, in some way, the sort of background or touchstone for working out your programmes. I merely put it to you as a case that has been put to us, not at all endorsing it or disagreeing with it; I merely want to know whether that is somewhat the same thing that you are thinking of, but not quite so narrow as education which you put forward?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, I certainly would not want to see educational funds confined to the narrow field of such things as school broadcasting and all that. I would certainly want to see some public funds used for the broader aspects of culture and so on -- for music, drama, and all these things. Certainly public funds should be used in that field, and I think we would be missing a great possibility of developing understanding in Canada if we neglected that, or if no public funds were used for that field.

MR. COYNE: That completes my questioning, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Mr. Laidlaw, you said earlier that you are not directly connected with CJFX, so it may be you are not in a position to answer the question; but CKFX is an affiliate of the Dominion network, is it not?

MR. LAIDLAW: That is right.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In the course of our travels about the country we have learned that television has been making many inroads on radio, and that it may be in the course of time necessary to abandon or break up the Dominion network. Do you happen to know how many hours a week CJFX is broadcasting, how much of that time is Dominion network broadcasting, and what the breaking up of the network -- I take it CJFX is a reasonably profitable venture now; would it affect it very badly if the Dominion network was broken up?

MR. LAIDLAW: I am not close to that aspect of the situation, but my impression is that it would seriously affect the station if it did not have the programmes that come through the national network. Do you mean programme content or the finances?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you were probably receiving 25 or 30 hours out of 100 hours a week, so the loss of all that network, also the revenue and the programming would be less; you would have to replace that with something else; that would be an added cost to the station which would make it less profitable?

MR. LAIDLAW: My own impression is that the station would lose a great deal of its programme content and I would assume it would lose a great deal of revenue if it were not for the Dominion network.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How wide a coverage have you got through CJFX, how big an area has that

station here?

MR. LAIDLAW: It is rather a surprising thing; the best coverage is, first of all, in industrial Cape Breton, also the west coast of Newfoundland; then up the Northumberland shore and into parts of New Brunswick. Strangely enough, coverage is rather poor near the station, but away from the -- I do not know how you would describe it, the technical aspect -- it runs on a straight line and off on a loop on the side -- the reception is rather poor.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you originate programmes? Does the Extension Department of the University originate programmes?

MR. LAIDLAW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How many hours a week do you have on the station?

MR. LAIDLAW: During what we might call the study club season extending from October to the end of March, our Department has two programmes weekly, one to rural people and one to urban people. Now, it is not in the number of hours, because sometimes these broadcasts last for more than an hour; Peoples' School is heard each Sunday afternoon from about the middle of October to the end of April. We have another broadcast called Life in These Maritimes, which is heard once a week in the same period. The actual number of hours is not great, it would vary from, say, 2 to 4 hours a week during those months.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you any idea of the extent of your listening audience? I will

tell you the reason I am asking that question. When we were in Edmonton the University of Alberta told us that they had originally had a station there over which they broadcast educational topics which was ultimately taken over, but they retained time on it, and in addition to straight educational programmes they broadcast music; and in a survey that they made they discovered that the listening audience of their educational broadcasts were diminishing, while those for music, which I judged was the higher type of music, not just say anything, the number of listeners was increasing; but for straight educational programmes the listeners were decreasing. I was wondering if you had made any surveys on what your listening audience was?

MR. LAIDLAW: No, we have not.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And you do not include music at all in your broadcasts?

MR. LAIDLAW: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one question and it is probably a very technical one or a narrow one. On page 4 of your brief, paragraph 9, you say:

"We favour the present system of broad-
"casting in Canada. It is a compromise
"between the British and American systems
"that is perhaps best suited to conditions
"in Canada."

Then you go on to describe why it is best suited. My question is perhaps just a slight quarrel with the use of the word "compromise". Do you really mean

that? Does that "compromise" carry with it the idea that there has been some kind of dispute, a conflict, that has been resolved by taking something of both, and that perhaps by talking about it as a compromise we obscure the fact that we have got a positive and unique system in Canada and not a compromise at all?

MR. LAIDLAW: Well, I, personally -- I am not voicing the opinion of my Department -- but I personally would favour the British system of broadcasting, and I believe that the Aird Commission, originally the basic idea of the recommendations of the Aird Commission said that they favoured public ownership in broadcasting. I do not know whether the word "compromise" should be used there. I would not favour the American system of total private ownership of radio stations, so whether we use the word "compromise" or not, I do favour the idea of the public ownership of radio stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: My only point is, you seem to me to be going on to say that there are very definite advantages of flexibility of service, local needs and so on in the kind of system we have got, and, as I say, it is a very narrow point but it seems to me that the use of the word "compromise" which has become a sort of weak word in our language may actually obscure what your real meaning is.

MR. LAIDLAW: Probably we used the word -- it is a blending of the two systems rather than a compromise.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is

any final conclusion on a question like that; I was just raising it because it seemed to be a contradiction between the use of the word "compromise" and your later statement in that pargraph.

I think we will adjourn for five minutes and resume with the next brief then.

Thank you very much, Mr. Laidlaw; we are very pleased to have had you with us.

---A short recess.

(Page 3314 follows)

SUBMISSION OF RADIO STATION CJCH, HALIFAX

APPEARANCES:

Mr. B.P. McCurdy.

Mr. Finlay MacDonald.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is from Station CJCH. I understand that Mr. McCurdy will present the brief; Mr. MacDonald will be here and a number of the members of his Executive Committee, who may take some part in the presentation.

We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 135.

EXHIBIT NO. 135: Brief submitted by Station CJCH, Halifax.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McCurdy, you have seen something of our method of procedure; it is very informal. The only thing I would like to say to you is that your brief is an important one and I hope you will give it an adequate and complete presentation.

MR. McCURDY: Mr. Chairman, I am not actually producing the brief. May I introduce myself: I am Vice-President of Chronicles Limited who are wholly owners of Radio Station CJCH. The Chronicle Company Limited is also wholly owned by the estate of my late father, Mr. F.B. McCurdy. I want to introduce to you Mr. MacDonald who will present our brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McCurdy, we will be very glad to have Mr. MacDonald present the brief.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, since the

appointment of your Commission a great deal of interest, of course, has been manifested in your hearings across the country, and in our organization a great deal of thought has been given to this particular presentation. The Executive Committee to which you refer is a group of gentlemen who are our department heads in the radio broadcasting operation. They are the actual draftsmen of our brief. The brief has been drafted over a period of months. Every member of our staff has had a copy of our brief, and since they have shown a great interest I would like to introduce them to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would very much like to have them introduced.

MR. MacDONALD: They are, Mr. Chairman:

Mr. Clair Chambers - Commercial Manager.
Mr. H.E. Gerard - Business Manager.
Mr. Sidney Pilkington - Continuity Manager.
Mr. A.G. McCleave - News Director.
Mr. R.A. Foster - Programme Director.
Mr. A.R. MacWilliams - Chief Engineer
Mr. Verne Glazebrook - Consultant Engineer.
Mr. Allan Campbell - Chief Operator.
Mr. T.J. MacDonald - Operator
Mr. Gerald Clark - "
Miss Norma Murray - "
Mr. Howard Silver - Salesman
Mr. G.A. Bailey - "
Mr. A.M. Peters - "
Mr. Lorne Miller - "

Mr. Edmund Morris - News Commentator

Mr. Gerald Regan - Sports Director

Mr. Paul MacDonald - Producer

Mr. William Fulton - Announcer

Miss Lena Spruin - Stenographer

Mrs. M. Sinclair - "

Miss Joann Tupper - "

Miss M. Daggett - Continuity Assistant

Miss Anna Campbell - Secretary

Mr. Larry MacLeod - Announcer

Mr. Ron Blom - Operator

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have those members of your organization present and appreciate the fact that they have taken the trouble to study and work out this brief. If you wish at any stage of this to refer to any members of your staff for purposes of answering any of the questions or amplifying any of your remarks, don't hesitate to do so. We are in the position that we haven't a too crowded schedule today, and I suggest you present the brief, and if it turns out it is a convenient time to adjourn, we may come back after lunch and go on in a more relaxed fashion as far as getting down to the questions is concerned.

MR. MacDONALD: Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, we believe our brief deals in the main with the terms of reference of (f), (b) and (c). In our opening pages we set out what we believe to be the concept that has been accepted since broadcasting first came under the scrutiny of the Government of

Canada as evidenced by the findings of two Royal Commissions, if the Massey Commission is accepted as a Commission dealing with broadcasting matters, although that was not entirely their object; and, of course, in the meantime by the findings of some ten or more Parliamentary Radio Committees.

The national system was made up of a number of highly-powered publicly-owned stations using privately-owned stations as necessary extensions to the system. The very term "national system" would suggest that from the beginning up to the present time private stations, or non-voting members, exist not as equal elements but as links. If this concept is not accepted, then competition is very real indeed. If it is accepted, then technically there can be no competition. We accept the concept.

Two: We describe the C.B.C. and its functions, concluding that without sufficient authority the C.B.C. could not achieve distribution of its product, implying our agreement with the premise expressed to this Commission that responsibility and authority cannot be divorced.

Our reference to regulations is not a case for non-regulation, but merely suggests that a certain compulsive sense of restraint is present in every broadcasting operation and that this is a healthy guide to good broadcasting.

We then discuss licensing: we regard the C.B.C. as the licensing body in Canada for all practical purposes, and we have no quarrel to find with

the policy. Although we put it in slightly different words in our brief, we do not agree with the suggestion that anybody who has a million dollars in Canada should have the perfect right to lose it in a broadcasting venture.

For whatever interest it may be to the Commission, we unburden ourselves of a few comments on C.B.C. programming, with particular reference to the Talks Department. Our reference to ratings was put there in case the matter came up or was of any interest.

We then try to reconcile the matter of the industry versus the public trust. Two schools of thought exist in broadcasting as to what the proper functions of radio and television are. One we regard as primarily the public trust, to be used as enlightenment and education; the other as a by-product of the entertainment business as an advertising medium. We feel that some reconciliation should be made between those two views. We make reference quite frequently to the report of the Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Sciences and Letters, a group of people,one lady and four gentlemen, who could not obviously approach their job with complete detachment because their report would have suffered if they had. They were concerned with certain values. Presumably this Royal Commission, looking for the same values but having as well to look into other practical matters, might conceivably modify some of the strength of some of the language in the Massey

Report -- a certain hostility or anti-commercial tone which in some parts was justified and in others not. In short, we consider broadcasting in Canada needs public and private agencies with each well defined, and it does not behoove a third party to make any suggestion to this Commission, outside of his right to do so, that is less than useful and proving the workability of those elements. We don't abide with these views that would emasculate the C.B.C. or weaken it or leave it inept, nor do we agree with those who feel that private operators are per se a group of people who have no interest in the development of the national system.

Our thinking respecting the independent regulatory body required a certain amount of time and soul-searching, and it is here we make our major recommendation. We agreed that the C.B.C. Board of Governors could themselves qualify as an independent -- as opposed to Separate -- as an independent regulatory body, and there were many reasons for our recommendations. One, if you accept the original suggestion or concept, if you will, that new values must be introduced in Canadian broadcasting, with the particular emphasis on Canadian values, then you can only succeed in part. To what degree I would not express, nor do we know. You can only succeed in part under the so-called private enterprise system. This is not a sinister demerit of private broadcasting. It is a perfectly normal state of affairs. If these values are worthwhile, without

putting ourselves in the position of arbiters, they must be imposed. The organization who imposes them must have the authority to do so. In the main, this authority means the control of the networks, and the organization in control of the networks is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Therefore, the C.B.C. must have authority to impose these values. Perhaps not all the authority it now possesses, but certainly the major part. If a separate regulatory body was set up, and if this original concept was still retained, then the separate regulatory body would only have to turn around and transfer all its powers to the C.B.C. We are convinced -- and we have, ourselves, advocated a separate regulatory body in the past -- that those who advocate this do so as a matter of principle. I see nothing sinister, nor do my associates, in their advocacy of that particular body. They view it through eyes possibly different from ours, but our support for this suggestion has been withdrawn, because a suggestion based on principle is not supported when a pattern of abuse or injustice over the years appears to be ever absent or unproven. However, because a great deal of public misunderstanding exists in Canada with respect to the function of the national system, which we believe does deny the national system a considerable amount of public support, rather than abandon the idea or the suggestion of impartiality, and taking into the consideration the apparent unfairness of the C.B.C.'s position, we suggest that the C.B.C.

Board of Governors themselves could qualify as this independent regulatory body. We have suggested the addition of two full-time Governors in addition to the Chairman and other members of the Board. We believe this would enlarge the sphere of knowledge, provide possibly a degree of continuity, and might effectively answer charges that the Board of Governors makes decisions which are mere formalities relying on advice which they have had little opportunity to digest -- acting as a rubber stamp for the C.B.C.

Finally in our brief we assume the repeal of a single-channel policy. We believe a private network at this time in Canada would be impractical for two reasons which we mention in our brief, and we conclude with the superficial but nonetheless definite opinion that the partnership we have described in our brief is the only workable solution, uneasy though it may be to do, that it is the only solution to the present-day problems in Canada.

On our brief we are prepared to answer any questions of yourself, Mr. Chairman, the Commissioners or counsel, and if there are any other questions not covered in our brief we will attempt to be of some use.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. MacDonald, I am not sure you were in the room when I opened this morning to explain our method of procedure. Your brief is a very comprehensive and interesting one, and your presentation has been also. We have adopted a pretty informal method of asking questions, and

since you can only examine one witness at a time you are necessarily putting to him to some extent the opposite point of view. That is not to suggest disagreement with your contentions, nor is it in any way to indicate we have reached any conclusions. It is merely a technique of trying to get at the full meaning behind the brief. We may interrupt Mr. Coyne during the questioning, and don't you hesitate to expand on any point you wish to expand on.

MR. COYNE: As a matter of procedure, Mr. MacDonald, I would like to go through your brief in the order in which you presented it asking various questions as we go along. Some of them will be more important than others, but rather than disarrange the arrangement that you have I would prefer to follow that arrangement.

Turning to the first page in your first paragraph on "background" of this situation you say:

"Most countries choose between two
"alternate conceptions as to the proper
"function of broadcasting",

and you describe one as a public trust and one as primarily a medium of mass entertainment and advertising. Do you think this is perhaps an over-simplified proposition? What I would ask is this: Wouldn't you say that in the United States broadcasting was regarded as a public trust? It is true the trust is exercised by private individuals without specific control over programming content, but isn't the whole concept of the F.C.C. and its

organization based on the proposition that broadcasting is a public trust?

MR. MacDONALD: I would think the legislation that set up the Federal Communications Commission in 1934 accepted, if only tacitly, that frequencies and channels were in the public domain, and I have no doubt that a great number of American broadcasters consider their responsibility in the nature of a public trust; but the reference made there was one with respect to that attitude of the Government or the people of a country with respect to their broadcasting values.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is really the distinction between public and private -- between the two? In your first alternative conception there is a public content not just in the licensing, but in the actual programming as well?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the other concept puts a greater emphasis on the private nature with the minimum of public -- at least in the programming content?

MR. MacDONALD: That is right.

MR. COYNE: I think my question may have been something of a quibble; I just wanted to make sure that we understood each other. Another general question arising really out of your statement at the top of page 2,

"Radio has indicated what a measure of

"Federal support can do",

in connection with the financing of our national heritage and that sort of thing: Would you say in radio this peculiar Canadian system of ours has been a success?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I would.

MR. COYNE: And a little further down in the page, near the bottom, where you are referring to finances, you say:

"In our view, it is absolutely essential
"that our national system be adequately
"financed."

Could you give us any help as to the meaning to be attached to the word "adequately"?

MR. MacDONALD: My colleagues and I regret that we could not give a little more assistance to the Commission on a matter which we know is of tremendous concern to you. We believe that if the Canadian people wish to continue what has been a valuable and a useful national system, as generally described, that they are going to have to dig down and pay for it. There may be many savings affected in the system and this may be offset, particularly in television, by the growing public appetite for it and the alternatives that would suggest themselves to us that would effect great savings would come perilously close to impairing, if not crippling, what we know as a national system. We have skirted the matter of financing. We have reason to believe the system is going to cost $16 million or $20 million in radio, quite likely $100 million in television

within a number of years. It is going to have to be paid for in the main out of public funds. We don't view license with a tremendous degree of apprehension; it is an unpopular tax and it would be nice to get away from it, but it is a way in which the individual can contribute at least in a small way to a national system.

"Adequate financing": It is hard to know how to answer the question in the sense of "adequate". It has to meet the demands the Canadian people will make on a system that is paying heavily for the luxury of loneliness and independence.

MR. COYNE: There should be sufficient finance to permit the system to operate and to fulfil the aims which you describe in your brief? In other words, lack of finances should not be the determining factor in reducing the services of broadcasting which the C.B.C. can provide?

MR. MacDONALD: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: While on that question, it has been suggested to us that one of the limiting factors that C.B.C. have had to contend with over the past years is the fact that they never knew how much money they were going to get in any one period of time, and it has been suggested that the grants from the Government should be of an amount sufficient to take care of their requirements and should be set aside for a number of years ahead so the C.B.C. could go ahead and properly budget their whole requirements knowing full well they would get

the money, and that as a consequence a certain amount of saving could be effected through the knowledge of having the financing over that longer period.

MR. MacDONALD: We would generally agree with not only their opinions on that matter, but also in general with the opinions of the Massey Commission in that respect, and would favour a statutory grant as opposed to an annual grant; something that would permit them to engage in some longer term planning than is now possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you generally agree with the fact that it is very difficult to run an efficient operation if you don't know what your income is going to be -- even with an approximation?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 3 where you are describing the C.B.C. and its functions, you state towards the bottom of the page -- you are describing the conception of the C.B.C., and you say:

"It both produces, distributes and
"regulates its own products. If its
"design were otherwise, the C.B.C.
"might become a producing source de-
"pending on voluntary acceptance of
"its wares by individual outlets. It
"could be a manufacturer without a
"market."

I think you commented on this in your introductory remarks, but would you expand a little on this question: In your opinion would this be a danger if

the regulatory and compulsive powers of the C.B.C. were divorced from its producing functions?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: And would you amplify your views as to why this danger could arise in those circumstances?

MR. MacDONALD: We believe it would be a very, very poor thing to have the C.B.C. in the same position as the National Film Board. If these values are worthwhile, then they must be imposed, and if they are acting strictly as a production source dependent upon the voluntary acceptance of various outlets -- in this instance radio and television stations -- we think the system would be rendered useless. We do not think it would receive the proper distribution; it would be spotty and erratic. I should say in all fairness that it is quite likely too it may achieve a reasonable distribution, and it may under certain circumstances get a fair percentage of their programmes aired over other outlets -- I presume privately-owned outlets -- but the opposite may be the case. We believe the opposite would be true.

MR. COYNE: So that given the premise, you must have the power to require the necessary distribution; that is your point?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: To clarify that point, though, are you in essence saying there are a number of C.B.C.-produced programmes now which would not be acceptable to the private stations? We are

very anxious to get at this point of view as to whether or not the programmes produced by C.B.C. are acceptable or not, whether they have a wide listening audience or not, because we have had such a variety of opinion on that, and just on the basis of your remarks to Mr. Coyne just now there is doubt in my mind as to whether or not you felt presently produced C.B.C. programmes would be acceptable?

MR. MacDONALD: We have no hesitation at all, Mr. Stewart, in stating that a great number of C.B.C. programmes would not be acceptable to private stations. I will change the language -- I will use another term: I will say a certain number of C.B.C. programmes would not be acceptable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that based on the fact there is something deficient or defective in the programme as such, or is it based on the fact that the programme is not of a kind which is likely to attract commercial sponsorship, and yet may be highly desirable to have in the overall content?

MR. MacDONALD: In part, Mr. Chairman. The whole field of radio and television production is littered with forms of costly errors. If it was left to the individual discretion in each area -- and with each radio station tastes differ, attitudes differ -- certain programmes would be acceptable to one and not to another for sometimes the flimsiest and smallest of reasons, and others for good reasons. I am not suggesting there is anything defective about C.B.C. programming of mechanics, nor am I

suggesting that by any means it is a perfect production agency. It is making all forms of errors, and producing programmes which are mediocre in the one instance and of extremely high calibre in the other. It is going through the growing pains of a production agency.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would it be fair to say that as a public system, having a duty to the public, that they must perforce produce certain programmes of what you might call a type that are not popular with the public?

MR. MacDONALD: I don't understand entirely the significance of your statement.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: First of all, they feel they have a duty to the public of Canada to bring to the public a better knowledge of the Canadian way of life -- so-called cultural programmes which have probably a very small listening audience -- and they feel, or maybe they feel, a duty to produce those despite the fact, and with the full knowledge, that it would not have a wide public appeal. That is the point I was trying to get at -- in other words, those they produce for more wide public consumption are, by and large, reasonably good.

MR. MacDONALD: Could you give me an example of a programme? Have you any idea of a series or type -- you used the words "for wide public consumption".

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I will go back to the Chairman's example of Macbeth. There is a pro-

gramme that should have had wide public appeal, a programme that has been criticized, and we have had many letters about it since we have joined this Commission, and there the C.B.C. thought they were producing a programme of wide public appeal, or, on the other hand, they may have thought they were producing a programme out of public duty for enlightenment of the masses.

MR. MacDONALD: I really do not understand how you can suggest that a programme has wide public appeal and then pin-point it as a programme on which this Commission has received a number of complaints.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it was a lot of letters on both sides.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I see. There is no particular one audience or one particular public. A programme that would appeal to less than a majority of audience would have as part of its viewing audience those people who also would appreciate a programme exactly of a nature diametrically opposed to that particular programme. The technique, as we see it, is to expose the people of Canada to as many different projects and experiments and types of things that different audiences -- it is not the same 10% or 20% that are listening to Macbeth who would be listening to Folio or Scope, or others which you have to work at. It is not the same group all the time. You may find people turning off Macbeth and enjoying Folio. It is a series of programmes which are supposed to contribute a special meaning to life

with the particular emphasis on Canadianism.

On your first point, Mr. Stewart, I agree with the editorial comment in Maclean's Magazine that it does seem ridiculous to have an expensive agency supplying the public appetite for Dragnet, but there are many reasons for the C.B.C., and it is set out in the Massey Report, the C.B.C. has to serve a variety of tastes. We believe the situation in time will shake itself out.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you may have answered this, but I am curious about the point that Mr. Stewart and I were after here. I can see that there is one approach which you have given, which is the way in which in the experimenting in a new field that you are going to make some mistakes and some successes, and you are feeling your way, and that is perhaps as good a result as you can expect overall, and as a matter of general economy this overall programming needs to go out and be tried as a unit; that is one way of putting it. But, isn't it also possible that with the concept of a national programme service, with these values we have mentioned of tying the country together, of making people work a bit on programmes for their final enlightenment, that you can do that with an overall system? Supposing they were all good programmes -- never had a failure at all -- which would be ideal, you would still have programmes in the kind of overall pattern which would not be suitable for being taken on on any kind of commercial sponsorship basis; they just

don't adapt themselves to commercial sponsorship, and therefore your statement that it should not depend upon voluntary acceptance of its wares by individual outlets, is based on the one hand ---

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, I am very sorry I did not answer that earlier. We are not speaking in economic terms. Yes, I would agree quite probably the programmes of which you speak would not be adaptable for commercial sponsorship, and that may be a major reason why they would not be acceptable to the commercial elements.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MacDONALD: I am sorry I missed the point in the first instance.

MR. COYNE: That commercial aspect might also be the distinction between the position in Canada, say, and the network system in the United States. I believe in any network, however organized, there must be agreements between the network and its outlets that the outlets will carry the network's programmes at certain specified hours, or certain specified programmes.

MR. MacDONALD: Oh yes, there has to be a very definite understanding to prevent complete chaos on the networks. There must be, in effect, a degree of authority exercised by the controllers of the network, be they privately-owned or publicly-owned.

MR. COYNE: Well, I suppose the C.B.C. may conceivably, without its compulsive powers, be

able to set up a network in this country similar to the networks that exist elsewhere, by agreement rather than by compulsion?

MR. MacDONALD: Using the services of private stations?

MR. COYNE: Private stations.

MR. MacDONALD: Undoubtedly it would be possible; undoubtedly such an arrangement would be possible. If you are asking me whether or not the C.B.C. could achieve distribution of its product without compulsion, I would be inclined to answer "no", but with certain reservations.

MR. COYNE: Really in pursuing your earlier answer to one of the Commissioners that obviously the network arrangement would be possible, I take it it would be your view that in our situation they could not succeed in getting the distribution of all the types of programmes they would want to distribute on a voluntary basis?

MR. MacDONALD: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 4 you come to Broadcast Regulations and you say that by and large the C.B.C. has discharged its duties well and that the regulations "have, in our experience, been fairly enforced". I presume when you use the word "fairly" your meaning is that there has been an absence of discrimination as between different stations or interests? It has been suggested to us on occasion that the C.B.C. has, in fact, not enforced its own regulations; for example, in respect of the number of spot

announcements and restrictions on recorded programmes in evening hours. Would you care to comment on that suggestion that has been made to us, that the C.B.C. regulations have, in fact, not been enforced in certain particulars?

MR. MacDONALD: When you use the term "partnership", even though one is a non-voting partner, it would seem to imply a certain degree of give and take or rapport between those two elements. You cannot regulate a station into better broadcasting. All it would act as is a deterrent against extremely poor broadcasting, if you will. The C.B.C. has made those stations which play hookey with some of the rules quite aware of the fact that they are doing so, and frequently, and maintained a department that is in continual liaison with the privately-owned elements in the system. I would not suggest that the C.B.C. has been remiss in maintaining its regulations at all. I think it has exercised its power as a regulatory board in a rather judicial and fair manner considering the complexities of the system.

MR. COYNE: One aspect of the regulations which has struck me is that many of them are not outright prohibitions on certain conduct, but they prohibit stations from doing certain things without the consent of the C.B.C. or without the consent in writing of a representative of the C.B.C., or some such phrase as that, which to me implies they contemplate a certain discretion on the part of the C.B.C. or its representative. Do you approve, generally

speaking, of that type of regulation in which there is some discretion in the C.B.C. to take account of practical circumstances?

MR. MacDONALD: We certainly do. I think the Chartered Accountants of this country have lived to regret the fight with the Barristers for taking discretion out of income tax matters and such.

MR. COYNE: You go on on the same page to refer to non-regulatory aspect of broadcasting conduct, if I may use the phrase, and you say:

"Implicit in the very prerogative of the
"use of the microphone is the obligation
"of self-control and respect for public
"morals", -

and up above you say:

"This happy situation was not brought
"about, however, entirely by regulations."

You do say, though, I believe, that it is brought about partly by regulations?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

MR. COYNE: So that you are just simply emphasizing another aspect of the situation?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I am not making a case for non-regulation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't the real justification for regulation that it gives a certain protection to the very large majority of people who agree with them and want to comply with them? A great amount of enforcement is voluntary in most laws, but you may have one or two bad actors, and if you allow

them to get away with something, then the people who want to obey the law are prejudiced.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it has been suggested that oftentimes a regulation has been promulgated with one or two stations in mind, and that the majority of stations have not behaved in such a fashion.

MR. COYNE: In the next section in which you are dealing with the C.B.C. as a licensing body, you say in the first sentence that for all practical purposes you regard the C.B.C. as the licensing body. I take it you are speaking of the practical effect rather than the precise legal power which I think you can say is vested in the Department of Transport; that is correct?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, it is.

MR. COYNE : Further down on the same page you say:

"We do suggest, however, that broadcasting
"is an activity that does not respond
"to free competition as do other busi-
"nesses."

We have heard much representation as to the effects or possible effects of competition upon broadcasting, and I wonder if you can expand a little on that statement, that broadcasting does not respond to free competition as do other businesses?

MR. MacDONALD: Before doing so, Mr. Coyne, I wish to underscore the statement in our brief that says that this is not based on the fear that another licensing body might show less regard for our invest-

ment by allowing more competitors into the field. We have not and we will not present any brief to a C.B.C. Board of Governors suggesting that another radio or television station should not be licensed in this particular area. Halifax has one publicly-owned television station and one publicly-owned radio station and two privately-owned radio stations, and I suppose, subject to correction, that if this general trading area of approximately 170,000 people was transferred to some part of the United States, that number would be tripled. I am not suggesting for one moment, nor are my colleagues, that there is not more room for other radio and television outlets in this area. These things have a tendency to level themselves off. Competition is, of course, a very healthy thing, and not only does the audience seem to expand by greater listening and viewing, but the funds that support these operations seem to come into being when the skeptics felt they would not be present to support other operations. Yet, the overcrowding of any area by radio or television stations has a tendency if it is overcrowded, if this can be proven, that it is overcrowded, it has a tendency to lower the value of the entire product. There is a tendency to produce programming at the lowest possible cost and to sell it at either the greatest cost or whatever the traffic will bear. There are other values besides programming. There are money values as well. Without coming anywhere within the spectrum of the Combines Investigation group, there are

certain monies which must be received for certain types of programming if the standard of that type of programming is to be continually maintained. If five or six radio stations were to establish themselves in this particular area and to engage in broadcasting with a view to getting the greatest audience and the greatest number of advertisers, I suspect that after a certain period of time whatever moral attitudes we have at the moment might be threatened by merely competing with them. The statement that is made that we do not believe broadcasting responds so readily to free competition is generally what we mean.

MR. COYNE: You are thinking in terms of general competition upon the quality of the product?

MR. MacDONALD: I refer only to the quality of the product.

MR. COYNE: If we pursue that for a moment, take a situation where there might not be, as you say, overcrowding; well, for example, we have just come from Toronto and considerable was said there as to the desirability of a competing television station with the existing C.B.C. station, and it was suggested that the effect of that competition would be to improve the quality of the programming that came on the television screen in Toronto. Do you agree with that general suggestion as to the effect of competition?

MR. MacDONALD: Of course we do.

MR. COYNE: It does, in your judgment, improve the quality of the product?

MR. MacDONALD: Of course it does.

MR. COYNE: Subject to your qualification about overcrowding.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Who is going to be the judge of quality ?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, even apart from that, I just want you to look at that answer again: Does it necessarily help? We all have a great respect for competition in normal commercial spheres, and the way in which competition tends to raise quality and lower prices, but in this field does this apply? Doesn't it to some extent depend on the nature of the competition? Let us take in another sphere -- the newspaper sphere: Supposing a very sensational newspaper suddenly starts up in a place; isn't that very apt to make the existing newspaper more sensational? If you have a radio station which goes in for only what you might call the cheapest type of popular appeal, isn't that necessarily going to bring down the quality of the other stations? Is it true that competition in programmes necessarily raises quality?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, we believe that competition in programming does raise standards. We state that unequivocably. There would be certain circumstances in overcrowding where you would reach the point of diminishing returns in quality, and you would start down the other side. I would like to scramble off this point as quickly as possible. I would suggest the only way to determine it is by an exploration of the United States where overcrowding

very definitely can be ascertained, and I suggest that the quality in that particular area is not of a standard that is experienced in many Canadian areas of similar size.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is lower?

MR. MacDONALD: It is lower.

MR. COYNE: Just before we leave it, what would be your answer to the Chairman's example of the sensational newspaper starting up and its effect upon the quality of the existing, let us assume, non-sensational newspaper? Take a situation of that kind; what is the effect of competition on the quality of product?

MR. MacDONALD: You are directing the question respecting newspapers?

MR. COYNE: Well, let us forget newspapers, and let us say radio stations?

MR. MacDONALD: Well, just as an interesting side, the number of newspapers in Canada has, for reasons best known to themselves -- I assume most of them economic -- declined to a considerable degree since the turn of the century, whereas radio stations have tremendously increased in numbers. I would assume that in those markets which appear to be able to support a number of newspapers that there are different types, there are different faces in newspapers as in radio stations; each one has a peculiar identity. I don't think newspapers have prostituted themselves because competition was sensational. I can think of several examples, but I do believe that in broadcasting

after you reach a certain point, and I have no way of giving a definition of that point, that the quality would go down, whereas in the process of adding the competition it would go up; it would reach a point and then go down -- the quality of the programming would go down.

MR. COYNE: Before you reach that point, would you support your proposition that competition improves the quality of programming? Is it possible in your view to support that proposition in the radio field by the actual experience that we have enjoyed where additional radio stations? Is it true to say that where additional radio stations have come into being in the different communities the standard of programming has improved?

MR. MacDONALD: For whatever value we may be to this area is in large measure maintained and is kept alert by the fact that we have excellent competition, and our decisions and plans are made in the teeth of rivals with respect to programming or what we will do on matters involving news or commentary or other things. Since mergence of the newspapers in this city we have constantly added more people to our news department so that we maintain a news bureau which gives us a relative independence to the gathering of news, and this has cost us a fair sum of money. Contrary to the popular notion, there is no way this can be passed on to an advertiser. It is a cost we bear out of our consolidated revenue. We believe it makes us a more useful station, and

if things got really tight and we had to cut expenditures I am afraid we could get along without our news bureau. We are now in the happy position of being able to employ commentators and a number of other people who bring a number of very useful concepts to our air without weighing the actual per unit cost of those things.

MR. COYNE: If you do that for the purpose of reducing costs, would it affect your position in competition with other radio stations?

MR. MacDONALD: It is a very interesting thing, we have not been able to determine whether this expenditure has actually been noticed in proportion to the amount of money spent developing. We have literally been incapable of discovering that, and, as a matter of fact, I may add just from the surveys that are taken, for what value they are to us in determining audience or audience trends, I would say that under certain circumstances, with all due respect to our News Director, that the opposite has been the case; we had greater listenership for newscasts than we do today. I don't know if Mr. McCleave has been responsible for that state of affairs.

(Laughter)

THE CHAIRMAN: Following this along, I don't want to get into any personal affairs at all, but take a case where you have introduced a more detailed and elaborate news service: Has this tended to cause other radio stations to improve their news service? I am looking for examples of what your

point is, that competition does improve programmes.

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, our contemporaries in this area maintain very good news departments, and every move or every action that they undertake -- sticking to the matter of news -- to improve their particular service is a source of immediate concern to us, and we usually take steps to provide a similar or better service.

THE CHAIRMAN: The existence of these news departments in the other radio stations would probably make you hesitate, even if times were tough, in eliminating your own news service?

MR. MacDONALD: Things would have to be particularly tough, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure your newsmen will be encouraged by that statement.

If it will not inconvenience you to come back I think this will be a convenient point at which to adjourn, and we will resume at 2.30.

---The hearings adjourned at 12.30 until 2.30.

---Upon resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. MacDonald, we were just coming to that section of your brief that starts on page 6 in which you deal with the C.B.C. as a programme body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before you get into that, do you think we might finish off on the question of the regulations, or are you coming back to it?

MR. COYNE: No, I was coming back to the regulatory body but not to the regulations as such.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, there was one question that comes into my mind which arises from a brief that was presented to us in Toronto where one gentleman expressed great indignation over the amount of redundancy that there was in the C.B.C. regulations. This gentleman mentioned a number of things; for instance, that it had to be in good taste and no profanity or obscenity or anything like that which he said was practical anyway, and he took great exception to the matter of the redundancy. Would you care to express any views that you might have on that subject?

MR. MacDONALD: If, Mr. Chairman, there is redundancy in the regulations it possibly may be that we have not thought of it in that particular light. I do not think that it is such an important matter to this organization that we would appeal to the Commission for elimination of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, merely stating

something which is generally acceptable, it does no particular harm?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The rest of my questions are all on the regulatory board.

MR. COYNE: On page 6 you say:

"It is as a programming body that the "C.B.C. has made its greatest contri- "bution to Canadian life, and the "necessity of some such body is not a "matter for debate. In order to please "all regions, the C.B.C. has, in radio, "originated programmes according to "some form of statistical proportion. "Such a procedure is admirable with "respect to a great number of programmes "-- information, commentary, special "events and the like. In many programmes "involving skilled artists (singers, "actors, musicians), the practical result, "however, is to foist mediocrity upon the "national audience."

Has this happened to any serious degree, would you say, in the operations of the C.B.C.?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know how significant the word "serious" is, but we believe and we state the opinion with force that the C.B.C. has often foisted mediocrity on the people of Canada through its programming.

MR. COYNE: And you suggest as one possible remedy for this:

"An alternative and much more desirable
"procedure would be to allow programmes
"to originate from those areas where the
"product is of a high standard, and,
"when programmes are originated from various
"regions, to make sure that the distinctive
"flavour of the programmes will compensate
"for other shortcomings."

Does not the C.B.C. strive to originate distinctively regional programmes for both regional and national audiences?

MR. MacDONALD: Possibly it may strive to do that, Mr. Coyne, but we believe that a great deal is left to be desired in the type of programme. What we are suggesting here in effect is that in certain programmes involving the artistic -- particularly in things involving music and everything to do with music -- it should strive for a standard of excellence, a higher standard possibly; and as this Commission has heard, there seems to be a desire on the part of many people to have programmes decentralized and originating, as they must, from the various regions; to at least start with programmes from those regions that are up to snuff. If they fall short of the mark in what might be called artistic standards, they can at least compensate for that by reflecting something which is truly of the region. Last night there was a programme from C.B.C. Winnipeg on television and it was a programme called "Pigalle", the story of life in Paris. This was an interesting or pleasant enough programme

but for the life of me we failed to understand why one of the rare productions of the C.B.C. network from Winnipeg has to be a story built around a French night club. Regardless of how interesting it may be there could be something more representative of that region. We are not making a fetish of having every programme coming from Halifax bearing the smell of the sea; we are not being self-conscious about regional characteristics, but we believe, and it is our studied opinion from observation over a period of time, that if there is a choice between two types of programming, that they should choose that which they can do best and, if possible, it should reflect something of the actual region. There should be quite a bit of material to choose from.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I just on this point ask if my impression from this part of your brief is correct? I gather the idea that you are, to some extent, criticizing the tendency of the C.B.C. to use programmes from other parts of Canada merely for the sake of getting them from other parts of Canada, and that, in other words, this notion that as a national body decentralization was an end in itself, and I gather what you are asking for was to choose programmes, wherever they originate, on the grounds of excellence?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, that is our point.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason I am asking it is, that we were making some enquiries about the

similar problem that they have in the United States on network programmes which are privately-owned, and the impression I have gathered from that is that for many kinds of programmes there are really only two originating sources in the whole of the United States -- the big network shows are either New York or Hollywood; that is, about 98% of them. The reason for that is a straight practical factor that that is where the top-flight excellent artists are to be had. Now, the private organization perhaps is in a position where it can do that; I imagine that the C.B.C. argument would be that they are supported by the taxpayers' money from all across the country and they should try to develop Canadian talent all across the country. You say you pay a price in terms of the programme content, is that then the guiding rule?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Well, I was going to ask you a somewhat related question. It really derives out of your statement on page 11 to the effect that this concentration of talent in Toronto and Montreal is an evitable development, and I was going to ask you what influence does this concentration of talent, which you believe is inevitable, have upon your suggestion for more distinctive regional programming?

MR. MacDONALD: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the point that is covered here is, we are referring to matters of artistic excellence, we are talking in terms of certain types of programmes -- all those programmes that involve the artistic. You cannot have

your oboe in Edmonton and your violin in Moncton; they are going to have to come together and be quartered in a central place, a place which is concentrating on that particular climate.

I would like, at this particular time if I may, this morning in introducing my colleagues I inadvertently failed to introduce one of the most prominent men in my organization and he has been hurt, he has sulked all through lunch. I would like to introduce Mr. L.G. Chapple, who has certain views on this matter and if the Commission accepts the views he has we are washing him off as a member of the organization. Mr. Chapple has had a considerable amount of experience in these matters; he has been with the C.B.C. for several years and is most interested in these programmes and has produced at least three musical comedies that we know of.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would be glad to hear you, Mr. Chapple.

MR. CHAPPLE: Well, I looked at the picture purely and simply from the question of centralization of art as opposed to the decentralization of art, and I came to a few basic premises that may or may not fit the bill. But, first of all, I feel a high standard of teaching is the basic prerequisite. That is, you must have a source of supply. Art will die if it is not supplied by people who are coming up, and the present population of Canada I do not think can truly support the fund or situations. The number of stations require more than one or two such high

institutions. There are one or two; for instance, at Toronto the Royal Conservatory of Music. But not only have you to grow in an equally high artistic climate, you must have a change of ideas. I put it down, I do not know whether it explains it too much, but the standards with which we are dealing, I think in art, and the maintenance of constructive criticism is only possible in an artistic community that has a free exchange of ideas. Now, in the reference in our brief to the best oboe player in Edmonton and the best violinist in Moncton, would come under that heading inasmuch as if you cannot bring these two people together at their highest level of excellence, then they must -- well, we will refer particularly to music -- with people who do not understand, they have no understanding of what they are getting at because their level of excellence is so far above them, providing you do not have sufficient schools to bring these people out -- we have a Conservatory of Music in Halifax; anyone who shows sufficient promise cannot possibly stop there because I feel they must go on somewhere, and you cannot have Toronto Conservatories and opera houses and symphony orchestras of the proper size, let us say, and excellence, spread across a country of 15 million or 16 million people. You cannot do it. In the United States it is not done; in England or anyone else it is not done to my knowledge.

Another point we excluded, we must presume the cliche "Jack-of-all-trades, Master of none" must

also apply to artists and music in Canada has yet to find the status of a profession except in those areas where students and artists can practice on a full-time basis. I know in Halifax -- I am thinking of one instrumentalist particularly who is a fine clarinetist, he has been to England to study and he has come back to Halifax, but he will never reach virtuoso status in Halifax if he has to play in a dance band at night, of course; he is ruining his lip for classical music by having to play in a dance band at night. We also contend that the majority of musicians exist in Canada by choice as part-time musicians. There are not too many musicians, to my knowledge, that can make a living in normal daytime hours of music and, therefore, if they are going to supplement music, their classical status and performance, they must do so as I said before by playing in dance bands or the like which keeps them out to all hours of the night. Any musicians that I know personally, particularly as it affects Halifax, are not particularly interested in ending up as 75-year-old trumpet players in dance bands. If they do not stay at music, even in dance music, they eventually must get into some allied profession of some kind for their old age, because unless they can grow musically sufficiently to give them a peak of excellence that can be appreciated in a community, then they cannot go on to teach their instrument, and that is the natural evolution of any fine artist -- he eventually becomes a good or bad teacher. It does not necessarily mean that because

someone is a virtuoso, that he can be a good teacher; but that is the natural trend for musicians.

There are a couple of other things: Only from a professional community can you expect to get a performance equal to that taste that has been acquired from outside influences. Now, this ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say that again?

MR. CHAPPLE: Only from the professional community, that is a professional community of musicians, can you expect to get a performance equal to that taste that has been acquired through outside influence, recordings from our neighbours to the south, B.B.C. transcription services. For instance, if the Halifax Choral Society were to internationally or nationally perform Handel's Messiah as they do each year, it is a fine performance on a local basis, but if it were to be done nationally it would suffer the comparison with the famous recordings which everyone can buy, and I do not think it is necessary, I do not think it adds to the growth of music. No group of musicians has the right to impose mediocrity on any segment of the public who are used to something better. The only hope they have of reaching a standard which is demanded by a highly-informed public is by bringing the best players together. Art needs an audience as it thrives only on appreciation in performance, and we, as private broadcasters, are willing to provide the platform. But should we seriously be expected to pay amateurs? That is in opposition to the continued request of the Musicians'

Union that we should provide employment. I think they refer to it as a community responsibility. Now, I do not exactly know what our community responsibility is towards music, that is necessarily towards live music, and they continually refer to professional musicians. I believe they have a membership of 14,000, but I hardly think that qualifies each one to be classified as a professional musician. As a matter of fact, I find it rather difficult to realize that, as I said, the majority of musicians exist in Canada by choice as part-time musicians, yet the protection and voice of unionism is only for those citizens who are only able to, or desirous of, attaining professional status; they do not work at their profession as such.

One other point perhaps would be that someone will say, "Why do you not put on amateur shows?" Well, I feel that amateur shows are like vaudeville -- they are dead, and we doubt that they were ever good radio really. I think it is just an evolution, it was something that came and went like so many things have done; nor do we think they were ever conducive to a high standard of professionalism. I do not think they are going to guarantee, just because you hold amateur shows--that is on radio--put amateur productions in front of microphones or amateur singers or instrumentalists or whatever they may be, I do not think it is in any way going to guarantee a future high standard of professionalism.

Another point on this subject: So far to

ur knowledge no other country has been able to avoid, s we were speaking before, the centralization of alent. As you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, in the nited States -- New York and Los Angeles -- perhaps he odd side trip to Chicago is where talent exists, nd it does that for that very reason. It must be n community centres, people must talk together, com- are ideas; and you must have, when you create this ommunity of people who are qualified to highly appre- iate music and this does not necessarily entirely pply to Nova Scotian musicians, but you do then create a large individual body of people who will go to support concerts. You cannot bring in outside talent from anywhere in the world unless you can pay for it, and it is done on concert subscription basis or an indivi- dual concert; you have got to have informed people to appreciate it. I think it was in the Toronto paper just the other day where a well-known Viennese singer from the Vienna State Opera performed in Eaton Audi- torium to 150 people. She broke down and wept, she could hardly go on, and said that she had never been so insulted in her life. That does not necessarily happen all over, but it tends to happen unless you can create this climate. That is, to my way of thinking, the basis on which we must start; we must start to build the normal way instead of starting at the top. I think the encouragement of talent locally has to be done through schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would just like to set against this, without in any way expressing opinion

on it, some of the other evidence we have had -- I think in two of the places out West, Winnipeg and Vancouver -- the point was made to us that the action of the C.B.C. in lending support and carrying programmes of the symphony orchestras in Winnipeg and Vancouver had made it possible to build these orchestras up into something which they could never have become without the C.B.C. It was not only the fact of making a better orchestra, it was gradually working its way up into a higher degree of excellence, and it also created a knowledge and understanding in the community of orchestral music which was something of the climate which you are talking about; not only carrying presentations of the Winnipeg orchestra in Winnipeg, but the general presentation of orchestral music in Winnipeg made it possible to build the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra.

MR. CHAPPLE: Oh yes, let us first consider and understand that the support of the arts as given today by the C.B.C. must not be underestimated or underrated in any way. I think what they are doing is an extremely good thing, but I also believe that -- I cannot speak for any other area than here, but I do know that the majority of the instrumentalists that make up the Halifax Symphony Orchestra are imported from other parts of Canada. What are we to do for art in Halifax if Halifax is to be a production centre? I think that has to be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Really what this other argument comes to, I would think, is that notwithstanding

some inadequacy of programming, that there is a long-term value in building up.

MR. CHAPPLE: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, as far as the assumption would run, it is worth accepting something less than centralized excellence of a programme in order to build it up in regions and gradually over the years create other centres of excellence, but you do not get it all at once?

MR. CHAPPLE: That is right, as long as this can be in proportion. I feel there has been a great deal of decentralization since the inception of television.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you think perhaps too much?

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes, too much, because -- this is pure theory of course -- but when the production facilities require -- and the very large production facilities require in Toronto and Montreal for television, they have farmed out a lot of their radio to other regions of Canada and I think they have put a load on these regions that they are not capable of handling at the present time, because if you are going to -- you must certainly have the best physical possibilities, if your musical accomplishment is less than perfect through the year, physical things that go with studios and engineers should be the very best to present the perhaps inadequate music in its best light; and that, of course, takes highly skilled and highly qualified people right

across the country, instead of keeping them in one or two production centres where they can also benefit from broadcast and experience.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition to the question of programming quality arising from this centralization or decentralization, there is also the question of cost. It is quite possible that an attempt to decentralize programmes is going to materially increase the cost.

MR. CHAPPLE: I should think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: My question is this, and it is a good one to ask in other than the centres of production, Montreal and Toronto areas: Say it was in the Maritimes, do you think that general public opinion in the Maritimes would support the notion that a centralization to a considerable degree in programmes, either to attain better programmes or reduce costs, would public opinion support that kind of policy, or is there a local jealousy or rivalry that goes on?

MR. CHAPPLE: I think it amounts to what you mean by "public opinion", it is a moot question. I think public opinion in this case must be assessed to the point of saying those people who are truly interested in improving the arts in Canada as a country should have no possible quarrel with the centralization of music or any other form of art, providing there is a general growth; that is, providing that the centres and the concentration of population in these centres that makes it possible to have them there, do not start to cut themselves off from the

rest of Canada.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Chapple and Mr. MacDonald, I still find some slight inconsistency which you may be able to clear up very quickly, in the light of this discussion between what you say on page 11 -- that this centralization of production facilities is inevitable and is desirable from the point of view of improving the quality of the programmes; yet you say on page 6 that in many programmes this has resulted in foisting mediocrity on a national audience, and you suggest, if I interpret you correctly, more culture of regional origination, presumably from regions where the talent has been drawn off to Toronto and Montreal. Is there any inconsistency there, or do I misinterpret what is on page 6?

MR. CHAPPLE: I hope you misinterpret, I am not sure. I think what we mean is, if we could narrow it down to a specific instrument, let us say a clarinet -- all right, there is nothing unique about clarinetists in the Maritimes, but there is something unique, I think, in the Maritimes about bagpipes. Well, let us turn to those things that are, as far as Canada is concerned, not general -- mind you, there is similar uniqueness -- gosh, how can you have them? You cannot, I know, but let us say the Maritimes are very much noted for folk music, it is one of the most productive folk music places in Canada. There are folk music centres in other parts, we will say in Winnipeg, but they are slightly different and interpreted in slightly different ways. The Ukranian

community on the Prairies has things to contribute to Canadian culture just as the French folk songs in Quebec, and perhaps in St. Boniface and places like that. There are things in the Maritimes that do not only reflect the Maritime flavour, but they are also done better here because they are Maritime than they could be by being done somewhere else just with somebody advising them from the Maritimes. We will say the same with Newfoundland, Newfoundland folk songs -- I hate to isolate it into one thing -- but let us take the clarinetists and put them in a centre where they can develop because there is nothing unique about them, but let us keep in the flavour. The Province is in the process of establishing a Highland village that will reflect the Scottish ancestry in the Maritimes and should be conducive to continuing this flavour that is purely Maritime and which you cannot transplant.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you say here if you are thinking in terms of a clarinetist concert do not originate it in Halifax if you can get a better clarinetist in Toronto?

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: If you are thinking of Halifax, look to those things which are distinctive to this region and which can be produced well?

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is that a fair summary?

MR. CHAPPLE: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I put it another way

to see if I get the point? I did not see the inconsistency which you apparently did, but I read these various points and it came to this: Whether or not that centralization in music, for instance, is inevitable in Canada, that the attempt to decentralize by the C.B.C. musical productions, has perhaps gone too far?

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That to the extent that you are going to originate outside of natural centres, try to make them something local and descriptive?

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes, I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: That brings both points together.

MR. CHAPPLE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 7 where you make certain comments on the Talks Department, and you say that in the Talks Department there is manifested a general tendency to fear controversy, healthy interchange of varying opinion, and the clash of ideas. My question is simply this: Have you any suggestions how this general tendency should be remedied or counteracted, this timidity, if you like, which you feel exists in the Talks Department?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have. In the first instance, it should be pointed out that this is not an original thought; that is, not only did you hear it in different places, I think two briefs in the West made reference to this, but also in the Massey Report there are at least two references

;o this matter:

"The C.B.C. has courageously refused to
"underestimate Canadian capacity and
"taste for serious music. We think also
"that it has accepted the Canadian capa-
"city and taste in purely intellectual
"matters."

By intellectual matters we include the interchange of opinions, including the critical. And again:

"We realize that speakers with no special
"knowledge or reputation in their field may
"be engaged because they have natural
"facilities for broadcast and a special
"branch of the matter is thought to have
"a special appeal to the listener. We
"think it is important to express our
"dissent of this policy."

In these two suggestions from the Massey Report we completely concur. Our concrete suggestion is that people engaged, employed in the Talks Department of the C.B.C., should not be categorized, the people who should head the C.B.C. Talks Department in the various regions should be people who have been chosen with care; they should be people who are intellectual-ly mature, have had a broad background of experience in a variety of different fields, and who may be attracted to this role by being given some privilege not afforded to other members of the Corporation. They cannot be categorized as such if the C.B.C. is to be on a national basis, sort of an embassador

rom the land of truth. If it is to travel the air-
ines alone as a critic and a builder of customs and
a developer of a sense of humour and stimulation of
iew ideas they are going to have to have some parti-
ularly well-informed people to discuss as groups
practically every policy, background of Canada, and
engage other people, outsiders, encouraging them to
participate in various forms of talks and programmes
and so on. We notice with the advent of television,
we mention this in our brief, there has been quite
a remarkable -- a definite change for the better in
this connection. Whether it is because of the unusual
characteristic of the medium or whether it is because
they have introduced some new personnel, or whether it
is because of the single-channel policy which has
forced the viewers to develop a taste for this kind of
thing, we are not quite sure. But there seems to be
a greater interest in such things as Press Conference
and that kind of programme. It depends on whether
you call that light or not but things like
Profile and Fighting Words -- there seems to be a
wide public interest in this type of programme.
There seems to be quite an interest in such things
as The Nation's Business, which never was so in
radio; the giving of time to political parties,
this is also the trend I certainly like to see be
encouraged if the C.B.C. is to have a monopoly on
the networks, and it is responsibility that is a
terrifying one to see that under no circumstances we
develop a lethargy to public affairs or talks.

THE CHAIRMAN: This happens to be a subject I am very interested in, because I think controversy is a pretty healthy thing to have and a good thing in society. Can you give us any suggestions as to what is the root of this timidity that the C.B.C. has? Is it the basis of the whole, the simple matter of not having personnel with the courage to go ahead and try things? Is it based upon the fact that they have been insecure financially? Is it based on some other factor? Is it hased on the fact they are always being investigated? I do not know. There is this timidity, this question of fear that you speak of apparently; supposing it is right, what is the cause of it in your opinion?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Does not that fear exist rather in those protagonists rather than in the C.B.C., because those men who are on the programme, they have nothing to do with the C.B.C. Do the C.B.C. make a poor choice of antagonists?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not know which question to give an answer to first. It little behooves the C.B.C., for instance, the C.B.C. Talks Department -- whether it is their fault or not we really do not know, but it little behooves them to put on some excellent, articulate gentlemen propounding a thought which is slightly to the left which is a perfectly intelligent point of view, and then, I do not know if the lady was on because one of our Halifax humorists always seems to be picking on her -- it little behooves a group of gentlemen

o put on the view of the left and the representative of the right turns out to be Kate Aitken. It seems like a very unbalanced thing, it appears there are not enough gentlemen in this country to carry on a controversy. I do not think it is a fault or responsibility of the C.B.C. other than the possibility that the person who arranged that did not fully explore the possibilities of getting a better person to represent the opposite side. Now, with respect to the timidity, this may or may not be an incredible demerit of broadcasting, but I do not believe ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my real question.

MR. MacDONALD: It may or may not be, we do not know, but we suggest that the C.B.C. top-level people would probably deny that existed because they have been truly trying to develop in Canada a greater autonomy for their operations and encouraging their people to embark upon a variety of new projects compatible with the general standards and policies they laid down. There is an awful lot of people in the C.B.C. and a lot of them fail to understand the concept of their system. The Talks Department is not a job for a fresh-faced boy; the person who runs a Talks Department is a person who must be intellectually mature, to repeat a previous phrase.

MR. COYNE: You think the development in television to which you referred perhaps lends some encouragement to the thought that this timidy that you speak of may be possible of remedy?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I will give you an

example -- I wish we had kept filed all the press clippings that have come to us over the years, but there was a despatch from Ottawa where a Senator asked the Speaker of the Senate in view of the critical situation in the Middle East what specific purpose had the C.B.C. in mind for filming such a controversial subject as the shipment of arms from Halifax. Now, if a C.B.C. cameraman is going to have his actions debated on the floor of the House of Commons every day, it would appear to be quite natural, if Parliamentarians consider the C.B.C. as a private preserve, why did the C.B.C. Halifax send a cameraman to film such a thing? It is embarrassing to us and it is natural there will be some form of timidity seeping in if the C.B.C. are going to be asked for a detailed explanation of every act on every kind of news.

MR. COYNE: Well, turning now to page 10 where you get on to your next section entitled "The Industry versus The Public Trust", and in the opening paragraph you are dealing with the matter of advertising. If I might just summarize the point that you make there and ask you if I am correctly interpreting what you say: I take it your point is that advertising has a proper role to play in the operations of both the private stations and the C.B.C.?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Is that a fair statement?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: Well now, going on to the bottom of that page and the following page, at the

op of page 11 you say:

"Any further insistence upon local-live
"artistic programmes is an unrealistic
"one, however."

That is on the part of the private stations, and I would like to ask you whether you feel that it is not right to insist on the private stations carrying any good kind of local-live talent?

MR. MacDONALD: Would you reverse the question, Mr. Coyne, to ask me if I think if the private stations should be compelled to carry ---

MR. COYNE: Let me put it in another way: Do you believe that the private stations should be compelled to carry any particular or given amount of local-live programming? In other words, is that a sphere where some regulation should be imposed upon the private stations?

MR. MacDONALD: No, I do not agree there should be any compulsion to force privately-owned stations to carry a percentage of local-live originated programmes.

MR. COYNE: Are there any regulations at the moment which are either directly or indirectly directed towards that objective?

MR. MacDONALD: Indirectly there are regulations with respect to the percentage of recorded material.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel that those regulations should be abolished, that they are wrong in principle?

MR. MacDONALD: I do not consider these regulations as being onerous.

MR. COYNE: Are they, in fact, particularly enforced in their strict literalness?

MR. MacDONALD: I cannot answer that question. Possibly looking at it from only representing one station, the fact that we have not heard about it probably must indicate we are living well within the regulations.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the section in the Broadcasting Act itself which empowers the Corporation to make regulations to promote and ensure the greater use of Canadian talent by Corporation and private stations, do I take it from what you say that the Corporation should not make regulations or should not be made to make regulations to promote and ensure the greater use of live talent?

MR. MacDONALD: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a distinction between local-live and entertainment content?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes. We will be prepared to give you a description of what we do along the lines you mentioned, but we view it from a different concept. We take the point of view that in 1932 when the Aird Commission brought in its report that radio be nationalized, but the first Parliamentary Committee suggested this may not be a good idea because there were a number of connected services that could be given by private stations to act as links in the system, they would do everything in their power

o make other things develop, this phrase "local-live alent", as well as provide a variety of other differ-nt functions on a local level. They were to xist on advertising revenues, the publicly-owned ystem was to use its stations and be pals, with hich we have gone on record -- our agreement is on ecord with that particular principle. They were hen to impose these values on these particular tations without having the station given the right o extract any payment for these rights which were orking links of the system. What more can you ex-ect of a link outside of producing that type of rogramme which he can do best compatible with his udget and other circumstances? There may be tations in Canada who can do more, and there may be a great number of them who are doing more than could e expected from them, but they are all outlets and C.B.C. has the right to channel its programmes through them whenever it so wishes, and these programmes are presumably of a value which the Aird Commissioners had in mind. The private stations are not trying to dodge their responsibilities in this count, but the very nature of the original concept, both in fact and psychologically -- that is a rather important point, I think -- requires a high standard of pro-gramming -- is going to be required from the publicly-owned stations and the network and those are going to be made available to and carried over these links, and that is your contribution to the system.

MR. COYNE: Well, this is really the

point: On page 11 you submit:

"We submit that the main obligation of
"the private broadcaster to the national
"system is in great part discharged
"by his prior agreement that his facilities
"will be placed at the disposal of the
"Corporation for the carrying of network
"programmes. Aside from originating
"acceptable programmes within his ability
"and his budget, what can be further
"expected of him?"

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, underscoring the four words "is in great part". We are not suggesting that once the network signs off that the private broadcasters then are free to carry on in nefarious ways.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason I was raising with you the possible distinction the regulations dealing with local-live content and regulations dealing with something of a Canadian content, whether they are local-live or not, was really in connection with another suggestion as to the second station. Let us take television, the alternative channel in television -- let us confine ourselves to that for the moment. How do you suggest that that second station -- it may be anticipating a question of yours later, Mr. Coyne -- how that second T.V. outlet should be handled? Presumably it would be a privately-operated station, although everyone has indicated that sooner or later this has to be passed and decided, and it is certainly put up to this

Commission for its opinion, what are the kinds of terms that you would envisage for the opening of a second television station if you already have an outlet carrying the C.B.C. programmes? Presumably you do not send the same programmes at the same time to a second station. If you do not do that you may have to produce additional programmes, and then you get into the problem of a second network in television which would probably be too costly at the moment; but how, and to what extent, should the programmes of the second station be controlled in terms of Canadian content as, if you like, in terms of license?

MR. MacDONALD: We do not visualize a situation that essentially is that much different than the existing point of view with Trans-Canada and Dominion networks, without making any comments, because we are not in a position to do so as to the availability of Canadian material; but presuming they are all kinds, by the time a second station will be licensed and assuming some type of network opportunity must be made available to them, not necessarily a simultaneous release network but on an inclusive basis. We would assume that the second station would have to bear the same obligations as the first, that they would be compelled to carry programmes; the second network would, as we have suggested, work also under the terms of the C.B.C. We do not say ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Does it not also -- you were talking about the obligation of the second station

o carry the programmes -- is there not the correspon-
ding obligation of the C.B.C. to supply the programmes?

MR. MacDONALD: Oh, we have made it quite clear that if the second network is to be set up, more public monies will have to be expended.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if we might just carry through with this subject now since it has been raised. It really starts at page 13 of your brief where you are talking about a second network and you say:

"When these second television stations
"appear in various Canadian cities,
"some opportunity for a network should
"be made available for them in addi-
"tion to their other programming."

My question, which you may have answered by your last remark, is: Are you advocating that the field of network programming should precede the change of policy which would authorize licensing of the second stations? In other words, should there not be second stations until there is some C.B.C. programming available to a network that can be formed of these second stations?

MR. MacDONALD: Well, programmes available, assuming that there were production facilities that were regularly feeding these stations at the time they were set up -- although money will not give all the answers to the problems in Canada, the fact that a production agency in Canada providing programmes to a second network will go a long way to

liminating the problems of which you speak. I am ot suggesting the licensing of second stations to be eld up until there is a stockpile of Canadian pro- grammes, no.

MR. COYNE: Well, there are two points of view that have been put to us on this aspect of it. The first is that the second station should be licensed right away, because in the larger centres they can make their way programme-wise if necessary by carrying the cheaper programmes from the United States. The other point of view, which I rather take it you are subscribing to, is, no, let us wait and not license these stations until there is some opportunity to feed them some C.B.C. or other Canadian-production programmes. Now, it has also been put to us that the production of Canadian programmes for such a second network will involve additional substantial expenditures which will have to be found. Now, those two points of view are alternative in this respect: one of them suggests that second stations be licensed immediately, regardless of programme content; and the other suggests that there should be facilities for producing programmes for these second stations before these stations are licensed.

MR. MacDONALD: Mr. Chairman, we believe that the time has now arrived, or in some instances has been passed, to license second or competitive or alternative television stations in those areas which, according to the licensing body, are prepared

o support that station, taking all other things ncluding economy into the consideration, and as of he time that this policy is hit upon that there should be an opportunity available to these stations, as you point out, not necessarily for their own good because many of them can survive quite handsomely without it, but in order to play with the same deck of cards that a network -- a second network -- should be provided to them under C.B.C.'s direction. I would take objection to the very important Canadian programmes -- the programmes that would be made available need not necessarily be Canadian; they would be Canadian whenever it was possible to have them available, but not necessarily Canadian programmes; say, programmes that can be secured from any country that might be programmes of value.

MR. COYNE: But presumably the programme would cost some money out of public funds?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir, it would cost more money out of public funds.

MR. COYNE: And then you are faced with the other dilemma -- at least, the C.B.C. would be -- as to whether they should spend their limited funds on programming for the second network rather than the first, concentrating on extending their first network into those areas that were not as yet enjoying television.

MR. MacDONALD: I could go back to a question you asked this morning. If you would

direct a question to us: "Do you favour the licensing of second stations before the first is given to all the majority of Canada?", we would only have to answer that: If the revenues of the C.B.C. in future are so -- if a given dollar to the C.B.C. costs 20¢ to keep a second station in operation in a market where there is already one, and the same 20¢ was required for the single-channel policy, we would have to state that the alternative or competitive station would have to wait. We believe in future if the revenues of the C.B.C. are that impoverished or that tight, even for the best reasons in the world, there are going to be other problems arise greater than that which you have mentioned.

MR. COYNE: What you are really saying, first of all, the time has come in Canada to license second stations, to provide C.B.C. with sufficient funds that they will be able to provide second stations with this programme which you recommend in your brief?

MR. MacDONALD: It is exactly our brief.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question on this point. On page 15 you say near the bottom of the page:

"They would be in effect, two networks,

"and they would be in competition."

I would like to ask you how you think that competition in the ordinary sense would be achieved if these were both C.B.C. networks.

MR. MacDONALD: It is a very good

uestion. I think there must be ways to -- it may be sychological but there must be ways to make these wo things competitive.

MR. COYNE: Would it be an advantage to ry to arrange things so that the two networks, even hough both C.B.C., were in some competition?

MR. MacDONALD: Highly desirable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am told some of the ommercial soap companies have vigorous competition etween two different brands of soap, the same com- any.

MR. MacDONALD: There are radio stations hich have been given a television license and have o arranged their activities as to place their radio perations in direct competition with their television perations.

(Page 3376 follows)

MR. COYNE: This, you suggest, would be a favourable thing for the C.B.C. to consider if they were developing a second network?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: I would like to revert for a moment to your comments on the independent regulatory body. I am looking at page 13, and I think you summarized your position with respect to this matter quite fully this morning, and I don't want to dwell on it, but on page 14 you refer as an example to the Director of Stations Relations reporting to C.B.C. Management on network matters and directly to the Chairman of the Board with respect to station regulations. That is a precise situation which we have frequently heard criticized; that is, not the fact he reports to two different people in connection with his two different spheres of work, but the fact that there should be two different spheres of work concentrated in a single individual.

THE CHAIRMAN: The criticism has been that station regulations and enforcement are under the same man's control, and it is said the techniques are different and the objectives are different.

MR. MacDONALD: No, I have no particular opinion on that matter, Mr. Chairman. Undoubtedly people who put forward that suggestion have had a great deal more experience than we have had in network matters. We are a station that has no affiliation at all.

MR. COYNE: You are unaffiliated?

MR. MacDONALD: We are unaffiliated.

MR. COYNE: So you have no particular feel-
ings about this situation?

MR. MacDONALD: No, not on the particular question which was just mentioned.

MR. COYNE: In the final paragraph towards the bottom of that page, where you are summarizing your thoughts on this section, you say:

"By placing the C.B.C. Board of Governors
"in a position where they would appear
"to be an impartial judge between public
"and private operating elements (even
"though they must necessarily decide
"in favour of themselves under certain
"conditions, to maintain control), the
"Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
"would achieve a greater measure of
"public support",

and I would like to ask you whether you feel that the "appearance" is important?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we do believe that the appearance is importance, because a great deal of public misunderstanding exists with respect to just exactly what the national system is. I think the national system is denied a measure of support that we feel it should have because of the incongruous position it would appear to be in. Whether these contentions are real or imagined, there is a great number of people who feel they do exist. "Here is this group of ogres who are running what

ppears to be a separate thing altogether, and telling verybody else what they are going to do as well". 'hat is not the situation. Somebody has suggested, 'Don't change anything; leave it at what it is and :all it by a different name" -- rather a highly- .nformed person made that remark with respect to that oint concerning the"appearance" of the matter. Iowever, we believe there is something besides appearance involved too.

MR. COYNE: But subject to the specific suggestions you make as to what modification should be made in the organization, which are not basic -- you are not suggesting any basic changes in the structure of the C.B.C. Board of Governors -- you feel that this change of appearance would result in greater public understanding and presumably support for this system; is that true?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, we believe that is so, but the appearances are not everything. That is only one point in our recommendation with respect to the addition of two full-time men. Appearance is only an aside; it is not a major issue in our recommendation.

MR. COYNE: I have just one final question. On page 17 in your conclusion, about the seventh or eighth line, you say, speaking of the C.B.C.:

"Some administrative tasks could be "performed by fewer people with equally "good results. The junior staff is

"underworked and overpaid; the senior

"staff, overworked and underpaid."

I would like to ask you whether that statement is based upon a general impression, or do you have any specific illustrations where fewer people could do the job with as good results and where the junior staff is underworked and overpaid?

MR. MacDONALD: Having looked around the room and seeing only senior C.B.C. personnel present, it does not take too much courage to amplify this. I am sorry, but again we must apologize if we are not helpful to the Commission. It must be frustrating not to have specific examples given, but we can furnish no specific examples, but we express this opinion with force. We believe the C.B.C. employees on the junior level are well-paid by the national standard. From our observations over a number of years, taking into consideration units of work, accomplishments, and even taking standards into consideration, we state unequivocally that many members of the junior staff of the C.B.C. are not deployed to the best advantage, that is, to the full extent of either their capability, their ability or their availability. Therefore, they are underworked, and therefore they are overpaid. The senior staff is not in a relatively similar salary position to justify the responsibility they bear in the fields of supervision and direction. Some of this may be inherent again, as we have mentioned, in a State enterprise system. As in private broadcasting it too

as demerits; we are not unconscious of that. Some of this is critical and some may not be. Undoubtedly this Commission has, through its independent studies, arrived at some conclusions about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say the junior staff is underworked and overpaid do you really mean at the junior level that the C.B.C. is over-staffed?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, it is another way of putting the same idea?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: There isn't enough of that class of work to go round for the number of people they have?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes. I don't know whether it can be easily substantiated, but the total payroll of C.B.C. Halifax, we believe, is something between 15 and 20% of the total payroll of the Halifax water-front.

MR. COYNE: Of the Halifax waterfront?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, what the Board of Trade would furnish you with in statistics if you asked them for the payroll of the waterfront, which was $4,200,000 last year. This is an opinion.

MR. COYNE: That completes my question-ing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In your preface or when you were summarizing the brief you took no exception at all to the powers held by C.B.C. In submissions that we have had across the country

he private stations, I think, take greater exception han anything else to the fact that in the event of n application being made for a license the C.B.C. ere required to make a recommendation to the Minis- er of Transport. You don't take the same excep- ion, I take it, to that mode of procedure?

MR. MacDONALD: No sir, we have no quarrel with the licensing policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I may interject there, in case you have another question, and I have one that relates to that point: It has been suggested that there is perhaps a distinction in regard to regula- tions -- those that are of the licensing character and those that are of the operating character and to do with the production and getting out of the pro- grammes, and that there may be some kind of inter- relationship between these two kinds of regulation, that perhaps the operating regulations are resented because they will in some respects affect the licen- sing regulations or vice versa, that there may be some virtue in separating in some way the licensing side of the regulation and the operation side of regulation. The thing I am trying to get at is that all across the country we have run into an at- mosphere which you can only characterize as fear, fear of the C.B.C. by the private stations. I don't think we have been particularly successful in running down the cause of that fear or the validity of it, but there certainly is a good deal of evi- dence that such a fear, rightly or wrongly, exists

? the C.B.C. by the private stations. I don't want
) press you on it, but have you got any comments on
hat line? Is it a justifiable thing?

MR. MacDONALD: Our colleagues in private
adio are going to have to speak for themselves, but
can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that we have absolutely
o fear of the big bad wolf. We have no fear of the
.B.C. I might make a comment there, Mr. Chairman:
e could envisage certain circumstances under the
resent structure -- possibly that is an important
oint -- where, if there were some personnel changes in
he Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the present
olerable position would be considerably changed. If
he Chairman and the Board or the General Manager
ere other than the gentlemen they are now, if the
hairman did not preside over his operations with a
ertain degree of not only knowledge of the inter-
neshed system he has to preside over, but if his re-
lations with the Government of the day were less than
courageous, and if certain other aspects were present,
we possibly should have to answer that question in
another fashion, but as of 1956 we will answer the
question, no, we have no fear of the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have had put to me some-
thing which is perhaps a totally different way --
the exact opposite of what you are suggesting, and
that is -- maybe it is the same -- that the atti-
tude of the senior officials of the Board is one of
great fairness and judicial approach, but that at the
lower levels there is not the same confidence. Let

is put it that way.

MR. MacDONALD: For instance, at the regional level, our relationship with C.B.C. Halifax ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it wasn't specifically at the regional level. It was put to us, at a more junior level outside the regions -- maybe at Ottawa.

MR. MacDONALD: There is personality conflict resulting in severe arguments and misunderstandings and so forth. Neither partner in the dispute has a monopoly of stuffed shirts, and people whom we have described as having -- well, their zeal is greater than their insight, of crusaders, of dedicated people, people who after employment at the C.B.C. for three months are convinced that they are the saviours of the country's destiny. These are matters that any confident broadcaster with any security at all will laugh off.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In your summary this morning you gave two possible definitions of Canada's present broadcasting system, one of them being that it is to be considered as an entity of which both the publicly-owned and privately-owned stations are integral representatives, and you said you went along with the second concept, and if no one agreed to it, therefore there was no competition. I don't know whether I misinterpreted what you meant by the absence of competition, but it seems you are in disagreement with the overwhelming majority of private broadcasters who seem to think there is constant competition. In fact, it is the basis of

heir request for a separate regulatory board -- the dea that there is so much competition they wish an mpartial body to supervise. Do you really believe here is no competition at all? Do you believe you re in such separate fields rendering a service and hat you are not in competition with them at all?

MR. MacDONALD: The comment made in our first paragraph of our summary was that the private stations since 1936 -- after 1932, and then in 1936, when the legislative framework was established for broadcasting in Canada, that the privately-owned stations were to operate as extensions or links in the system. A station not on the network is still considered part of the national system. We would consider ourselves part of it even though we don't carry on a regular basis any C.B.C. programmes. If there is this so-called partnership, even though one of the partners, to put it in extreme degrees, is a little miserable non-voting partner, then technically if that concept is accepted, technically there can be no competition. I think the matter of oil companies and dealerships was brought in, which may not be entirely acceptable, but generally speaking that is the point. We are getting on to what techniques there may be in competition. If it is not accepted, if the two elements exist as equals, then it certainly needs a separate regulatory body, and competition is extremely real, but carrying it further, the Massey Commission sets down reasons why the C.B.C. must be in the commercial business. They conclude

y saying, "As long as the United States maintains a ommercial system, the Canadian system can never be ompletely non-commercial", and they give their rea- ons: one, commercial programmes are good in them- elves; secondly, relations between American and anadian networks result in a lot of sustaining pro- grammes, etcetera, etcetera, but nowhere in that justification for the C.B.C. being in the commercial usiness did they visualize a situation where through a slight change in policy or through a panic as to where the next policy was coming from, the C.B.C., as in the case of Halifax, had to get into the commer- cial business. The Massey Report did not visualize the packing up of two transcribed spot announcements at every break between programmes. They are in the commercial business with a vengeance, and there is nothing whatever to do with those reasons mentioned as justifiable. They need the money.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you not also find yourself in competition for listening audience?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You said several times that is a very generalized use of the word "competition"?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is like saying you are competing for the consumer dollar?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, and another thing, we recently polled a good number of our staff, cer- tainly the eight gentlemen who drafted the brief, and we took a small informal poll and we said, "Do you

onsider the C.B.C. as a competitor in the Halifax
rea?", and the answer was invariably, "no".

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: From the commercial
ngle?

MR. MacDONALD: No, not in the commercial
ngle, but the answer was "no" to that general ques-
ion, "Do you regard them as a competitor?" Another
hing, we have provided to the Canadian Broadcasting
Corporation 41 people over the years formerly full-
time with us and now full-time with the C.B.C.; former
CJCH employed as free-lance, and present CJCH employed
as free-lance artists with the C.B.C. -- there are
ten. Free-lance artists employed regularly by both
CJCH and C.B.C. -- you don't provide 41 people to
a competitor -- I meant to say the first ones we had
no choice over it. They left us and went to the
C.B.C. That was 13. But of the others there has
been a provision of our people to the C.B.C. on a
local basis. We have made it possible for them to
work with the C.B.C.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We have heard a
lot about the second network, particularly in tele-
vision, and we have also heard a variety of views
as to whether or not there is sufficient talent in
this country to support a second network. You
have spoken here today about talent and mediocrity
versus proficiency: do you believe there is suf-
ficient talent to run a second network and still
retain the talent we expect to receive over the
television?

MR. MacDONALD: We would not suggest that here isn't a great deal of talent in this country t present locally, regionally and nationally. We ould not suggest for one moment there is a dearth of otential talent. Whether or not there is a sufficient amount to operate a second network, we are ot in a position to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one final question, Mr. MacDonald. Assume that your concept of he partnership between public and private radio and elevision is accepted -- and whether it is or not remains to be seen -- but let us assume it is so, at one stage you referred to it as "uneasy though it may be": Have you, from your experience, any suggestions as to how the recognition of the partnership could be made more clear, how the "uneasiness" of the partnership can be reduced or eliminated? Is there something that can be done? Should people be in a position to get out of the partnership and have their stations taken over, let us say, if they don't want to stay in it in those terms? Is there any unfairness in the way it has grown up historically? What can be done, if the concept of a partnership is accepted, to make it a more easy partnership, a more recognized partnership and a more workable partnership?

MR. MacDONALD: We would agree, Mr. Chairman, that it has grown in a rather unusual fashion, but it was not envisaged that it would not be like it is today. As to our suggestions for making the

artnership less uneasy we can only reiterate our
ajor recommendation with respect to the C.B.C. Board
f Governors as being one tangible way in which it
ight, and then to suggest, with all respect to the
ommission, that other matters are going to have to
e handled as a process of growth.

THE CHAIRMAN: You go on living with this uneasiness the same way as some people have to live with ulcers?

MR. MacDONALD: "Ulcers" was your word, Mr. Chairman, not ours. The C.B.C. is roundly and soundly investigated; I think Mr. Dunton suggested that one-third of the time of himself and his colleagues is spent dealing with investigations. I am afraid this will continue to be necessary as long as that amount of public funds is expended in the national system, and I think that acts as much as a puristic element in keeping the partnership a reasonably well working one as anything, and possibly in a number of years, with population growth, it may be possible to invent a system whereby the State can achieve distribution in its own stations from coast to coast and they and the private network would operate in direct competition with one another.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, you think, a long way ahead?

MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I think that would be an ideal arrangement, to have two complete systems, one public and one privately-owned in severe competition one with the other with a separate

oard between, but we cannot visualize that as being ractical at the present time, and that is the cast long which we prepared our brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Acting only on this ssumption that such a partnership concept is to be cceptable, I don't think there is much danger that veryone investigating and looking after it and advising and instructing the C.B.C., they are going to ecognize, but my question really is, how do you get he private parties to recognize the partnership?

MR. MacDONALD: We have enough difficulty looking after our own operations.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: It occurs to me that on page 8 you do refer to it, and you say:

"With all due respect, we should like
"to urge this Commission to place
"little dependence on superficial re-
"search statistics, particularly the
"type which purports to show the
"numbers of listeners or viewers at
"any given time."

And you go on to say:

"... the information so gathered is
"at best of debatable accuracy."

Would you tell us the source of your skepticism? Do you think these are not very thorough or why do you distrust these audience surveys?

MR. MacDONALD: I don't think my colleagues can bear the entire responsibility for the insertion of that paragraph. I will take the full

lame for that, sir. I am an anti-pollster. I hink radio since its inception has grossly under-stimated itself as a medium because of the dependence hey place on little surveys. They haven't seen hemselves in full range and full-length perspective. hey didn't make decisions as to what their program-ing or policy should be without thinking of, how is his going to affect an audience or affect a listening group. If you stand for nothing, you stand for anything, and if quality has to be determined by the amount of noses, you reach a point of neolism. We do not subscribe at the present time, and for some time, to audience surveys. We subscribe to general measurement surveys with separate overall coverage -- the Bureau of Broadcast Information. We provide a great deal of light entertainment, a great deal of what somebody might call flimsy entertainment. We feel we are serving a useful purpose. We are one of three stations in the market, and each one complements the other. We are not making a case for complete minority programmes, but we know why we do that and we don't have to run to a book or a chart to find out why we do it, and the reason that was placed in there was because we have always taken objection to the use of such statistics to conclude that public monies are being wasted because C.B.C. programmes appeal to less people. That was the lead-up to that main conclusion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. McCurdy, we want to thank you very much. You

aturally know we are expressing no opinion on the tatements made in your brief, but I think I would ot be fair if I did not express my personal, and believe my colleagues' opinion that we appreciate he time you have taken to prepare this brief and lso the way in which you did it, to make it a brief oming not only from one or two people in your or- anization, but virtually from the entire organization s you have described.

We thank you very much.

MR. McCURDY: We thank you also for being allowed to appear before you.

SUBMISSION OF CHNS, HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA

APPEARANCES:

Mr. G.J. Redmond.

Mr. G.W. Dennis.

Mr. G. McL. Daley.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you know our procedure here, from listening to the previous brief?

MR. REDMOND: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may either read the brief, or summarize it, and then we will have some questions.

MR. REDMOND: With your permission, sir, I think perhaps we will pass over the preamble

nd take up the three major sections of the brief.

Radio Station CHNS is substantially in agreement with the brief submitted by The Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. It supports the three main recommendations of that brief, but wishes to make a number of observations on each of these matters.

1. IMMEDIATE LICENSING OF NON-GOVERNMENT TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS IN ALL AREAS OF CANADA.

Radio Station CHNS supports this recommendation and submits that a change of policy would provide Canadians in all areas with a choice of programmes at one time from Canadian sources. Competition of this nature would be healthy and, in time, would result in improvement in programme quality and service. It would bring about increased viewing at a faster rate than the present single channel policy in the six major Canadian centres.

While supporting this recommendation, it is the belief of this Company that since the pattern of television broadcasting is now established in the six major centres of Canada, the timing of a new licensing policy is of utmost importance. The change from a single television station policy should be accomplished in such a manner and at such a time that there be no curtailment of present service and no reduction in present programme standards; and further, that the change in policy be brought about at a time when competitive service would not mean ineffectual and inefficient operation on the part

f either operator.

It is the opinion of this station that the elevision potentialities of all areas should be xamined and assessed; competition from television tations outside Canada should be considered; and he nature impact of colour television should be valuated so that when the change of policy is effec- ed all television broadcasting stations, public and rivate, will be in a financial position to maintain igh programme standards and successfully promote the uture of this great medium.

II. CREATION BY LEGISLATION OF AN INDEPENDENT REGULATORY BOARD FOR CANADIAN BROADCASTING.

Radio station CHNS supports this recommendation and submits that The Canadian Broadcasting Act e amended to provide for a new, independent regulatory and enforcement body under which all radio broadcasting stations in Canada, whether privately or publicly-owned, should be governed. From such a body here should be a right of appeal to the Courts on questions of interpretation. It is the opinion of this station that implementation of such a scheme would be in keeping with our fundamental democratic principles.

However, it is not the intention of this brief to criticize the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the manner in which it has carried out its duties under The Canadian Broadcasting Act. It is the opinion of this station that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has displayed an understanding

f the problems facing the broadcasting industry
nd has exercised its regulatory function in a fair
nd impartial manner. This policy, and the fact
hat all radio, both public and private, tends to
elf-regulation in the public interest, as well as
n its own, has provided a workable system for regu-
ation.

III. THAT PRIVATE RADIO AND TELEVISION BROADCASTING STATIONS BE GIVEN THE RIGHT TO FORM, AT WILL, THEIR OWN REGIONAL AND NATIONAL NETWORKS.

It is the opinion of this Company that this recommendation by the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters should, at least in part, receive favourable consideration. There does not appear to be any sound reason to justify the refusal to private enterprise of the right to set up and operate its own regional network facilities for programmes of interest to listeners in the area or region. Such an exchange of Provincial or area programmes could aid in the development of new Canadian talent and attract additional listeners to radio broadcasting.

As to national network operation, CHNS takes a realistic view of the present situation. For so long a time as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is charged with the responsibility to provide a Dominion-wide service of programmes of such national character and scope as will foster Canadian unity and an appreciation of our heritage, and is so engaged, action to change the present policy with regard to national network operation should not be undertaken.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Redmond; do you wish to add anything, or will we go straight to the questions?

MR. REDMOND: I think perhaps we will go straight to the questions.

--EXHIBIT NO. 136: Brief submitted by Radio Station CHNS Halifax, N.S.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Instead of following a logical pattern, may I start with the last sentence of your brief and try to work backwards?

MR. REDMOND: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You say, "For so long a time as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is charged with the responsibility to provide a Dominion-wide service of programmes of such national character and scope as will foster Canadian unity and an appreciation of our heritage, and is so engaged, action to change the present policy should not be undertaken." Do I take it that this last sentence of your brief applies to the whole brief or only applies to section III of your brief?

MR. REDMOND: Section III.

THE CHAIRMAN: And really only as to national network operations, I take it?

MR. REDMOND: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I just wanted to clarify this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us see if I have it

ight: You say, in effect, that your belief is that ational network control by the C.B.C. is essential o the carrying out of the policy of national pro- ramming?

MR. EDMOND: Exactly.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Redmond, coming back o page 1 of your brief, you are in favour of the mmediate licensing of other television stations in entres which are now served by C.B.C. stations or by rivately-owned stations, and I take it you don't ake any difference between the type of station?

MR. REDMOND: No; this was written to apply o the single-channel policy in the six major centres, ut we have no objection on that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How would you visualize he operation of a second station? Would you visual- ize it as completely independent of C.B.C., or would it receive part of its programmes from C.B.C., and, if it does, would it pay for the programmes produced by C.B.C. and broadcast by this station?

MR. REDMOND: May we take those one at a time. As we visualize it, sir, we feel that the second television station, particularly in the six major markets would be a competitive television station. It may be that in the licensing of that second station certain agreements could be worked out as to a per- centage of programmes that C.B.C. was anxious to have viewed or seen in the area, supposing that its own No. 1 outlet could not handle all the programmes -- and I am thinking now particularly of these pro-

rammes of a national character; it may be that be-
ause of commercial commitments, or for other reasons,
second station may have a working agreement with
he Corporation for the release of certain programmes.
owever, that would be purely a matter for the
orporation to decide. Apart from that, I would
ay that the second station would be a competitive
station and would offer to viewers in the area an
lternate programme service. I would say that the
station would have to be programmed strength against
weakness and weakness against strength, if you follow
me.

THE CHAIRMAN: In that concept let us assume, to make it simpler, that there are no national programmes that the C.B.C. is not getting satisfactorily out on the existing station, and you have got a second station set up there without any need of any other obligation except in, say, emergencies: I am not quite sure I know what you mean by saying it is a competitive service. Do you envisage any controls at all on the programming of that second station? Let me be specific: Would you be content, assuming they could sell the time, that they could put out nothing but old American movies?

MR. REDMOND: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at all?

MR. REDMOND: Don't misunderstand me, Mr. Fowler. I don't think that a second station programming old American movies would place itself in a competitive position. I think its programming

would have to be a lot better than that. I think a large percentage of its programming would probably have to be local-live.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why do you think there is such a difference between television and radio?

MR. REDMOND: There isn't, sir, but I am pointing out in a city such as Halifax with three radio stations, we are competitive on the programmes side. We are extremely competitive on the programmes side. I would think that a second television station would have to be competitive too to secure an audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not indulge in the disc jockey programme here?

MR. REDMOND: There are disc jockey shows here, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is not a conclusion, but it is an impression or a contention that has been advanced before us, and certainly was found in the Massey Report, that in the field of radio the unaffiliated private station has in many cases, not in all, tended to be a pretty continuous programming of recorded music interspersed by spot announcements and weather reports. This is the charge. There is some evidence to support it in some places. Why couldn't that same thing happen on a second television station?

MR. REDMOND: It might, Mr. Chairman, but I think today we have come a long way since even the Massey Commission Report was written, and I think today that programming is a lot keener, it is

lot better in many respects than it was a number of ears ago. I think there is a realization on the art of broadcasters today, and I think on the part f public as well as private, that your programming oday must be good; you must programme for all seg- ents of your audience and you must do it well. arlier this afternoon there was a discussion on ediocrity: I think, each in their own category, a tation today must provide the best of a type that t can, subject to its financial limitations, etcetera, nd I don't think any station today can exist on pro- gramming programmes of mediocrity.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will know a good deal more about whether there has been a change since the Massey Commission because we are having a programme analysis made of not only the C.B.C., but of the pri- vate stations. Am I right on this point, that you, in effect, are saying that the programme content of the second station should be left to these competi- tive forces and not the subject of regulations? Suppose it turned out that a good commercial success could be made by turning out nothing but old Ameri- can films -- to put it in its extreme position -- and supposing these could be sold as an advertising medium for carrying spot announcements; do you think these very rare extra channels should be allowed to be used in that way?

MR. REDMOND: To reply to that question, I don't see the danger that they would be, because the second station would of necessity have to

perate in the public interest, and by that I mean
n the interest of its viewers, and I don't think it
ould last six months; it would go out of business
f it attempted that type of operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there are such types of
peration in radio?

MR. REDMOND: I don't think there are today,
ir. You said a moment ago that you will know that
lot better at the end of this, but I don't think it
ill be nearly as severe as you think.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I think that the exchange
etween the Chairman and yourself has turned around
he question of films and kine recordings. Now let
s go one step further: Am I right in assuming that
ou would not like to have any control over the type
f programming that the second outlet would have?

MR. REDMOND: I am not in favour of regu-
ation.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are not?

MR. REDMOND: Of any kind. Now, I realize
hat let us say in working out an agreement for a
etwork there must be certain conditions. That is
ne thing, but regulation as to programme content
nd things of that nature, I believe is better
andled by self-regulation than by compulsion. I
on't agree with the compulsion principle. I don't
hink it achieves the purpose for which it is in-
stituted.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt,
Mr. de Grandpre, but I have mentioned this before:

his statement has been made to us as to the nature f this problem and we are going to check the facts, ut these are what we have been given: that for a iece of moderately good light entertainment for alf an hour on television produced in the United tates for about $30,000, a somewhat similar, less laborate but reasonably acceptable programme, is pro- luced in Canada comparable to that first one for 12,000 or $14,000, but you and I operating a second tele- ision station can rent the rights of the American pro- gramme for $2,000. What kind of self-regulation is ever going to get over that disparity? I mean, if ou are operating it as a commercial venture, are you ot compelled by that kind of economic force to go lmost exclusively to the $2,000 deal -- if you are in the business for profit?

MR. REDMOND: That could very well be, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if so, this rare channel, of which there are only one or two in every place, is going to be devoted exclusively to the im- port of, let us say, live American programmes, and I am saying, do you want that? Do you contemplate that as a good use of that channel in the national interest?

MR. REDMOND: I feel that you are taking an extreme case, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are trying to test this business of whether or not, assuming there were second channels -- and you are saying there should be

no regulation, and that it should be left to self-regulation -- and I am trying to test the validity of that self-regulation.

MR. REDMOND: I realize that.

THE CHAIRMAN: And so, naturally, I put an extreme case.

MR. REDMOND: Yes, certainly. I still feel that the self-regulation, in your own interest as well as in the interest of your listeners, would take care of it, sir. I submit to you that it would.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So self-regulation would be regulation by their listening audience, really?

MR. REDMOND: Yes, it would, that is correct. That is the point I am trying to make, and I don't think any station can exist if it has not public acceptance. So, in the final analysis, I submit there would be a good deal of self-regulation.

(Page 3403 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I am making is that it might really be a pretty high measure of public acceptance; there might easily be a number of people who are glad to get a continuous fare of light entertainment and nothing else. We had an example of that in Toronto when they said that a lot of listeners in Toronto tune in to Buffalo pretty much most of the time for this exact kind of programme. I am still putting to you the question of whether or not it is -- whether these relatively rare channels which we have in Canada can wisely be devoted to that kind of use? It is not as though we had any number of them; half a dozen doing this and half a dozen doing something else -- we have not got that.

MR. REDMOND: My only answer is, since the question was put that way, on the individual operator; that is asking whether he had a sense of responsibility or not, and I cannot give you any other answer.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Then you go on to say this would be healthy because it would result in improved programme quality and service. This question has been asked of Mr. MacDonald this morning and I am putting to you again this afternoon: Do you think that possibly with the exception of the news service, do you think that competition has a tendency to improve the quality of the programme, especially if you want competition without any strings attached the way you suggested it before?

MR. REDMOND: Oh, I think it has a most healthy effect.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you not think if you do not have any restrictions on your type of programmes, and if, strictly on a commercial basis, you attract as big an audience with films and imported material, that the tendency will be to force the other station to do the same thing?

MR. REDMOND: I think perhaps there are a few basic principles that I should state here, and I can only speak for myself, I cannot speak for other operators; but when this was written it was envisioned that the programmes of all types would be of the highest possible quality. This is not a question of lowering standards, this is a question of improving standards. I am not thinking particularly of the competition between American films or that type of thing -- I think we had in mind here more local-live production, the improvement of local-live production T.V.-wise in presenting programmes of the highest possible quality. If we take that as our basis of discussion, then I say to you that competition of that nature is bound to improve the operating techniques of both parties, whether they be two public or two private operations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, why "bound to"?

MR. REDMOND: Well, my concept of competition is that it is a healthy thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I go along with you in a general way as I many times have said in these hearings, and I think I have made known my regard for competition in its ordinary application to the sale

f goods, but I am bound to say that the kind of vidence we are getting makes me wonder whether the ame rules necessarily follow in the broadcasting phere. One of the old textbooks I had said that ompetition tended to lower the price, but I wonder if n this sphere competition raises the price or raises he cost?

MR. REDMOND: I would submit it raises the uality too.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may, but it raises the cost and that is running contrary to the normal rule. Normally competition brings the price down, but it has been pretty well established that in this field you introduce competition and you increase your costs. It is certainly happening in England with the emergence of the I.T.A., and it is perfectly obvious why, because there is an alternative market for the artists to go to.

MR. REDMOND: I was going to submit too, when you are dealing with the Corporation that is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, I wonder if you can plainly say that you believe in competition and, therefore, you will get better programmes?

MR. REDMOND: This is a question of reconciliation. As for myself -- and, again, I speak purely for myself -- my interest would be in improved quality in the public interest, improved quality of programming in the public interest. I feel the standard should be continually raised, our sights

hould be raised, we should be striving for better rogrammes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And your answer should lso be qualified by saying providing the financial ressures are not too hard.

MR. REDMOND: I agree.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But I take it that this uggestion of the licensing of an alternate station n Halifax, that it should be accomplished in such manner and at such a time that there be no curtailent of present services and no reduction in present rogramme standards? These are very wide expressions nd I would like you to explain a little about this ualification.

MR. REDMOND: Yes. It is our opinion that, in spite of the tremendous demand for programme creation, that the C.B.C. have done a most commendable job in television. It is an excellent beginning and we would like to see it continued. We would like to see ways and means found for permitting the Corporation to continue with even better production in the future, and we are a little afraid that the undertaking of a second television station in some, if not all markets, might mean a reduction in the income, could possibly mean, let me say, could possibly result in a loss of revenue to existing stations, and we place this thought before the Commission so that if and when -- and the time may be now or in the future -- but when the time comes to change the single-station policy, that provision be made in advance so that

he Corporation would not suffer curtailed revenues nd, secondly, have to lower its programme standards. hat was our point here.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And that is why you indicated that timing is of the utmost importance?

MR. REDMOND: Yes, that is right; that was our reason for suggesting timing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be fair to summarize your point -- this would be your point: That you would favour introducing the second station as quickly as possible, provided the money was made available to pick up this slack?

MR. REDMOND: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if the money is not presently available, then that may be a reason for deferring the second station?

MR. REDMOND: That could very well be a reason for that. We want no lessening of the quality, we are interested in the future of television and we want to see it progress.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you also want an extension of coverage for parts of Canada which are not yet reached by television facilities today?

MR. REDMOND: Exactly.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, coming to the second point of your brief, the appointment of a separate regulatory board, you say this body should have the right of appeal to courts on questions of interpretation. What do you have in mind when you refer to questions of interpretation, because the Canadian

Broadcasting Act now provides the right of appeal to the Exchequer Court on questions of law.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that section?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Section 21 (7):

"Where the Corporation orders the "suspension of the license of a private "station under subsection (6), the "licensee may by leave of a judge of "the Exchequer Court of Canada appeal "against such order to the said court "on any question of law arising out "of the making of such order and the "said court may stay the operation of "such order or suspension pending its "final decision -- "

Is that the same provision that you would like to see incorporated in a new Act?

MR. REDMOND: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Or is something different?

MR. REDMOND: No, we wanted to make sure this would be retained so there would be an appeal on questions of law. That was our position.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, why do you feel that an independent body is necessary?

MR. REDMOND: Our thought on this -- and again I would like to emphasize here that we have no criticism whatsoever of the C.B.C. and its regulatory authority; we think they have done an outstanding job, it is a very difficult, trying one and they have handled it very well, but we do feel that any person

who is in the operational field, in the programming field, should not have the regulatory authority over another person in the programming field or any organization in that programming field. That was our basic thought here. I would like to go on and say we feel if a new and independent regulatory board were set up, I think one of the members at least should be someone from the judicial field, and equally important I would suggest that one member of this board would be someone who has had wide experience, if possible, in operations, radio and television operations, so that there would be an understanding of the matters brought before it. It would be a little difficult, I would think, in a technical field such as radio and television to have a tribunal that was strictly judicial follow some of the implications and so on of a case brought before it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say a new and independent regulatory board. Now, you will surely admit there is no particular virtue in newness?

MR. REDMOND: No, none.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if there is, it soon wears off.

MR. REDMOND: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is there that this new and independent regulatory body would have that the present C.B.C. Board of Governors does not? They have the experience, they are qualified by experience-- no doubt some of them have had legal experience -- they are appointed to look after the public interest

and you say they have never failed to do it?

MR. REDMOND: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you expect to accomplish by having this new board set up?

MR. REDMOND: We are back again, Mr. Chairman, to my principle of competition. This is merely a principle; we feel that it is not in the best interests to have a competitor regulating you. May I put it this way: It is the principle here rather than any actual incident or series of incidents that we are discussing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But at the present time how do you say there is competition? You see, we have just had a brief which argues that there is no competition, virtually it is a single operation, a partnership similar to the way in which an oil company will distribute its products to another part of the country, partly through its own outlets and partly through others. Where is the competition today? You do not have it in radio for local advertising?

MR. REDMOND: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not have it in national advertising because it is either network or not, and if it is not network it becomes local.

MR. REDMOND: It is not network; it is not available as national revenue for the station.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right, so you are not competing for that in television; you are not competing because you have a single-station policy, so you are trying to apply a principle, but where

loes the competition exist?

MR. REDMOND: Mr. Chairman, I submit that there was competition first on the programme side, that we are definite programme competitors for audiences; we compete for audiences every time we turn on a microphone, public and private. That would be my first statement, sir. I do suggest to you that we are competing for national revenue, national business in the sense that if an advertiser buys national network and that budget is allocated and not available as national revenue to the individual station; I think there is competition for personnel at pretty well all levels, and I know we look upon our station as a definite training ground. The gentleman who testified here a few moments ago pointed out the number of staff members on his station who had gone to C.B.C., and we look upon that as a very natural development, we feel we are a training ground for the larger system.

(Page 3412 follows)

COMMISSIONER STEWART: What would the ppointment of an independent regulatory body do to ffset competition?

MR. REDMOND: I just mentioned that as an side, but I consider we are competitors for audience nd for revenue on the national scene radio-wise, nd the personnel is the secondary point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing what you have mentioned, either competition for audience or for personnel, supposing that exists, how does that affect the need -- create the need for a separate regulatory body? I can see that you would have a case for that, perhaps, if you were able to point to a situation in which the existing body was somehow faced with a conflict between its own interest and its public duty. Does such a situation exist at all today? What particular form of regulation today creates in the mind of the C.B.C. Board of Governors the feeling, "If I do this I will be hurting my own interests"?

MR. REDMOND: Probably none. I know of none.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, are you justified in asking for $75,000 or $100,000 a year to support a separate regulatory body when we are trying to save money?

MR. REDMOND: Well, we are back again, Mr. Chairman, -- I would like very much to be able to help you on that point, but it is purely a matter of principle here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you about that:

ou say at the end of the first paragraph:

"It is the opinion of this station ..." --

nd I hope you understand the purpose of these ques-
ions is not to indicate any judgment at all ---

MR. REDMOND: I know they are not.

THE CHAIRMAN: "It is the opinion of this
"station that implementation of such a
"scheme would be in keeping with our
"fundamental democratic principles."

What on earth do you mean by that?

MR. REDMOND: I can only reply again, sir, to the fact that under the laws that regulate the lives and affairs of free men, if I may put it that way, you do not have regulation in any phase, whether it be legal, business or anything else, of one man by a competitor.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know. I think there is such a principle in the American Constitution, but I wish some lawyer would tell me where this appears in the British or Canadian Constitutional system. This doctrine of separation of powers is definitely an American concept, and I am not at all sure it is a Canadian one.

MR. DALEY: Is there any other illustration where it exists other than radio, Mr. Chairman, where a person can sit in a position as judge -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Redmond has already stated that we are not too much opposed to this, but at the same time, on a question of principle, is there any other place, in other businesses or any other situation

here it exists in this country?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we did put it to the Minister of Telephones in Alberta that they are operating a telephone system and regulating the privately-owned Edmonton Television System.

MR. DALEY: They are not in Nova Scotia.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is one illustration.

MR. DALEY: I think it is fundamentally contrary to the principles of British justice that a judge should also have any interest, direct or indirect, and the greatest objection that I can see to this situation is this, that our system of administration and justice, and this is somewhat akin to it -- it is a regulatory body and not altogether a judicial body -- but our system of the administration of justice is such that surely we should shun the very appearance of bias in a system of this kind. That to me is the great objection and the only real objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is putting it somewhat differently from -- although it may be fundamental too -- "fundamental democratic principle" is what you are arguing for. But the alternative, and I put it to you, is, first of all, apt to be costly.

MR. DALEY: Well, those are practical matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we are charged very definitely with considering costs.

MR. DALEY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has also been suggested

o us that there is danger of weakening the present, hat the last witness referred to as "partnership oncept". I think the overall answer to your ques- ion to me is, I can think of nothing else that has his kind of mixture of public and private activity in it, and therefore you are not going to get very far by analogy.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Mr. Dunton pointed out to us that under the terms of the Act the C.B.C. must carry on a national broadcasting system. They are given that responsibility, and to carry out the responsibility they must have the authority. Since they have not an overall system of their own they must operate in partnership to some extent with the private operators, and as such he requires author- ity over them to carry out the responsibility that has been placed on him by this Act. The only other way he could do it would be to blanket the whole country with C.B.C. stations.

MR. DALEY: Which would be very unfortunate.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It would be very unfortunate, and very expensive to get.

MR. DALEY: This may be an exception to the rule, but that was our objection. It is purely a theoretical objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I am not sure it is an exception to the rule. It may be a thing in which you have to have special rules for a very special matter.

MR. DALEY: Quite.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Referring to the third point of your brief, you advocate the formation of regional or local networks?

MR. REDMOND: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As opposed to a national network. You state:

"There does not appear to be any
"sound reason to justify the refusal
"to private enterprise of the right
"to set up and operate its own
"regional network facilities ....":

You use the word "refusal", and we were given to understand that the C.B.C. had never refused.

MR. REDMOND: That is right. We did not intend to infer in any way that the C.B.C. had ever so refused. This was meant in an entirely different meaning. We know the C.B.C. is most co-operative and most helpful and will accede to that sort of request at any time. However, purely from a technical point of view our only question here is one of convenience and speed. It is not always possible to plan this type of operation too far in advance; the spontaneity disappears. Suppose a matter of regional network broadcast might originate in Halifax; suppose someone arrives who we think would be of great interest to be heard in Yarmouth or Moncton, or on a network of Halifax, Moncton and Yarmouth -- and I am not talking particularly of commercial shows; I am referring to sustaining features as well -- by the time you go through the procedure of securing

permission, contacting C.B.C. and getting permission to have the network set up, and so on, it is conceivable that on occasions time will have run out so that the programme you want cannot be handled. I have no specific illustration to give you. Again we are dealing with theory, and I feel it may be possible to have some such arrangement, particularly on a regional basis, whereby programmes of that nature could be exchanged by private stations merely calling the line companies to set up the line and doing a job of that kind. The second part of this recommendation was meant to assist C.B.C. We felt it could be that a group of Maritime stations could do a good deal to develop local talent in the area. We know the C.B.C. is doing an excellent job along that line. We are charged with it on a national level as well, and we hoped it could be that local stations in an area could assist by developing talent, by presenting network features, and again I am not referring to commercial network features. I think many of the stations would be prepared to do this sort of thing frequently on a sustaining basis if we had the privilege of joining stations together on an area or local network.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is your complaint ---

MR. REDMOND: This is not a complaint, Mr. Chairman. This is a new suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. Is your suggestion that there should be complete freedom, complete consent, or that there should be a less cumbersome

rocedure for getting the consent?

MR. REDMOND: A less cumbersome procedure ay work satisfactorily. It may be worth a try.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that some kind of traffic regulation on this kind of network business is very necessary?

MR. REDMOND: Quite. We would have to work out some sort of understanding.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Because even on a regional network you may get into difficulties there because of the necessity of certain of the stations carrying on national programmes.

MR. REDMOND: Oh yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: At a particular time.

MR. REDMOND: I agree.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So you are not looking for a perpetual license to operate a network?

MR. REDMOND: No, we are not.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So we could re-draft suggestion No. 3 and delete the words "at will" which you have added at the end of the second line.

MR. REDMOND: Having come to an agreement and understanding, and having defined the terms under which we would operate, I think the words "at will" should remain, based on the understanding that we have worked out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have asked a lot of questions. Thank you very much. We will give it consideration, and we appreciate your coming

ere and taking the trouble to prepare the brief and
esenting it to us. Did you wish to add something?

MR. DALEY: If I may state this, Mr.
hairman: In regard to this question of television
tations, if private industry is to broadcast on tele-
ision stations it must do so on the basis where it
an hope to pay, otherwise we are going to get in-
erior programmes; a paying station is essential.
n our opinion it does not follow that the whole six
ities which are now served by the C.B.C. television
tations should get television licenses -- that private
parties should get licenses simultaneously. The mar-
kets of such cities as Montreal and Toronto are alto-
gether different from the markets of such cities as
Halifax, and perhaps Winnipeg -- certainly Halifax,
which is much smaller than Winnipeg. In other words,
if the Government or licensing body feels that licenses
are justified in a city of 1½ million, like Toronto
or Montreal, it does not necessarily follow in a
city whose population is about 150,000 such as Halifax
at the same time. It may be necessary in the
national interest, and in the public interest, which
is, after all, the interest of the seeing audience,
that the licenses should be granted at a later date
in relation to the locality. Possibly the experience
of the larger centres in proving that competing
stations can exist, and exist profitably, would be
of value to the smaller centres.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, what you are
really saying is what I think has appeared in almost

veryone's comments on this subject, that it is a ques-
ion of timing.

MR. DALEY: That is correct; that is what
ve mean by the question of timing in our brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

(Page 3421 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one other brief to e presented this afternoon from the Canadian ederation of Newman Clubs and Mr. R.J. Flinn is ere to present it.

MR. FLINN: The hour is getting late. Do ou wish to sit further or adjourn until tomorrow?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we will hear you.

SUBMISSION OF CANADIAN FEDERATION OF NEWMAN CLUBS

APPEARANCE:

Mr. R.J. Flinn, Q.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as 137.

EXHIBIT NO. 137: Brief presented by Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed to present your brief?

MR. FLINN: The Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs is a National Association of Catholic Students who attend Canadian universities, other than Catholic; the purpose of such Association is to provide for the spiritual, intellectual, social and recreational formation of its members, over and above what their respective universities give, by means of chapel facilities, chaplains, doctrinal instruction, halls for social and recreational use, and, in some instances, residence facilities. The Canadian Federation of Newman Clubs has organized

Alumni units in cities across Canada. Halifax Alumni Club is presenting this brief on behalf of the Federation.

It should not be surprising then, that there exists in this Association an understanding of the mutual relationship among all the agencies which elevate the mind, encourage character, and perfect personality.

"The wild, living intellect of man", as the patron of the Newman Clubs described it, is something whose primacy and rights are in the natural order, of divine origin. Of it, we cannot and should not be suspicious; towards it, we cannot be indifferent, even less, cynical; with it, we cannot be but sympathetic and patient. It is a positive approach towards the things of the intellect that we assert and advocate. We state this for the reason that we have sensed a certain danger to intellectual thought, and more so to its diffusion, in Canadian radio and television. True, somewhat responsible for this is the valid reaction of those who found in the glib words and unscholarly superficialities of self-styled intellectuals, too readily accepted and termed such, nothing intellectual or inspiring. Too, we realize that there is a limit to the amount of time which can be devoted to intellectual pursuits and those forums subservient to such. But, the cultures, and their origins, which founded this country and made it great, were evolved by men whose intellects were at the service of the community, and whose leadership in

nought, diffused as best possible, gradually raised
ven higher the things of the spirit and of the
ind in the mass of men, struggling, unconsciously
t times, for something better.

We warn that any encouraged or tolerated
olicy of anti-intellectualism will dwarf the
rowth of this great land of ours, sap its heritage,
ndanger its stability and democratic institutions,
nd mock that spiritual faculty by which men most
early reflect the image of God. To the end we desire,
e would be happy to see more men of intellect,
scholars, men of learning and culture available to
anadian listeners and viewers; we can do without
hose whose faculty is to shock or affront the con-
science of the nation. In a day of specialization,
it is also possible for avenues of communication to
attempt a synthesis that would link these specialized
fields. And we think it possible, too, for competent
intellectual pursuits to vastly aid the instruction
and integration of so many new people who have come
and are coming to our shores.

Great churchmen and statesmen have warned
that the future struggles of nations will be "battles
of ideas" fought for "empires of the mind". This
nation cannot afford to lag in the struggle, if it
is to remain Christian and democratic.

The preeminent dignity of the intellectual
involves no plea for license, irresponsibility or
disloyalty. We deplore these in all realms, in-
cluding too, that of morals.

If television, when well regulated, can be an effective means of a sound, Christian democratic and cultural education, it is also true that it is not free from dangers, because of the abuses and evils to which it can be perverted by human weakness and malice. These dangers are all the more grave as the power of suggestion of this invention is greater, and its audience wider and more indiscriminate.

Different from the theatre and the cinema, which limit their plays to those who attend of their own free choice, television is directed especially to family groups, made up of persons of every age, of both sexes, of differing education and moral training. Into that circle it brings the newspaper, the chronicle of events, the drama. Like the radio it can enter at any time, any home and any place, bringing not only sounds and words but the detailed vividness and action of pictures; which makes it more capable of moving the emotions, especially of youth. In addition, television programmes are made up in great part of cinema films and stage productions, too few of which, as is known from experience, can fully satisfy the standards of Christian and natural moral law.

Finally, it should be noted that television finds its most avid and rapt devotees among children and adolescents, who, because of their very youth, are more apt to feel its fascination and, consciously or unconsciously, to translate into real life the phantams they have absorbed from the life-like pictures of the screen.

It is easy, therefore, to realize how tele-
ision is very intimately bound up with the educa-
ion of youth and even the sanctity of the home.

When one considers the incalculable value
f the family, which is the very cell of society,
nd reflects that within the home must be begun and
arried out the physical as well as the spiritual
evelopment of the child, one cannot fail to proclaim
o all those who have any position of responsibility
n television that their duties and responsibilities
are most grave before God and society.

Public authorities especially have the duty
of taking every precaution that that air of purity
and reserve which should pervade the home be in no
way offended or disturbed; in this regard even the
wisdom of antiquity, moved by religious respect,
declared: "Let no improper word or sight cross the
threshold of this home . . . for the child one must
have the utmost reverence".

The painful spectacle of the power for evil
and moral ruin of cinema films cannot but produce
horror at the thought that this poisoned atmosphere
of materialism, of frivolity, or hedonism, which
too often is found in so many theatres, can by
means of television be brought into the very sanc-
tuary of the home. One cannot imagine anything
more fatal to the spiritual health of a country than
to rehearse before so many innocent souls even within
the family circle those lurid scenes of forbidden
pleasure, passion and evil which can undermine and

ring to lasting ruin a formation of purity, goodness nd healthy personal and social upbringing.

For these reasons it is opportune to make he point that the normal vigilance that must be exercised by the authority responsible for public entertainment is not sufficient, in regard to tele- vision programmes, for securing broadcasts unobjec- tionable from the moral point of view. In television, where there is a question of pictures that will pene- trate the santuary of the family, a different criterion of judgment is necessary. So one sees the ground- lessness, especially in this field, of the pretended rights of absolute freedom of art, or of having re- course to the pretext of freedom of information and of thought, since here higher values are at stake which must be safeguarded; and those who offend against them cannot escape the severe sanctions threatened by the Divine Saviour. "Woe to the world because of scandals . . . woe to the man through whom scandal does come!"

It is hoped that the noble sense of res- ponsibility of those who have authority in public life will avail to forestall these deplorable occur- rences. It is hoped that as far as programmes of cinema or drama are concerned, judicious norms will be forthcoming, aimed at making television serve as a healthy recreation for people and contribute as well in every way to their education and moral improvement.

We realize the difficulties of censorship;

e do not fear it, as some do. No one has a greater respect for liberty and freedom; we realize they do not include license. We admire self-imposed censorship and we consider there is room for public censorship -- the Criminal Code and, even, the C.B.C. regulations are a form of such. The natural law is common to all who affiliate with any religious body; and even to those who do not. It is regrettable that some individual presentations on CBC-TV have been open to objection in the past on the ground that they have gone counter to this very law. Judicious norms will avert such unfortunate incidents in the future.

We should like to note, too, that the first universities grew up out of Faith. Now that we have progressed along the path of knowledge, we trust that there will still be room for Faith, and we hope that adequate provisions will be made for presentations of a religious nature through a Religious Advisory Board.

We would not wish by this brief to be understood to be unappreciative of the efforts of the C.B.C. in the past. We would commend it for the manner in which its programming has been planned. It is our hope that with its growing stature, new triumphs may be realized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Flinn.

Mr. de Grandpre, have you some questions?

MR. de GRANDPRE: I just have one question, Mr. Chairman.

As I understand your brief, when I perused

t, Mr. Flinn, the Canadian Federation of Newman lubs makes these representations in the form of a arning rather than in the form of a complaint?

MR. FLINN: Oh, that is correct. The brief s aimed at the programming for the future. We are ıot complaining particularly about what has gone on ın the past.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure, Mr. Flinn, you will realize this is an important point you are making. You have made it clear that it is in the way of a warning to put on the record for guidance in the future. It is not the kind of point which is open to much questioning.

MR. FLINN: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not like the other two briefs this afternoon which were open to a great many questions on specific matters of administration.

Thank you for your brief.

MR. FLINN: Thank you very much. It was a pleasure to be here.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn now until 10.30 o'clock in the morning.

---The hearings adjourned at 5.45 P.M. until 10.30 A.M., Wednesday, June 20, 1956.

22

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

HALIFAX, N.S. JUNE 20, 1956

v. 22

I N D E X

SUBMISSIONS BY:		Page
THE HALIFAX SYMPHONY SOCIETY. Dr. Margaret Gosse. Dr. C.M. Jones.	...	3430
THE MARITIME LIBRARY ASSOCIATION. Miss Alberta Letts.	...	3453
THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS Mr. A. O'Brien Dr. A.A. Giffin.	...	3463
CANADIAN HOME AND SCHOOL PARENT-TEACHER FEDERATION. Mr. Harold Simpson. Mr. Willis M. Hall.	...	3513
NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL BROADCASTING. Dr. H.P. Moffatt. Mr. T.V. Dobson.	...	3556

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

No.	Description	Page
138	Brief of the Halifax Symphony Society.	3431
139	Brief of The Maritime Library Association.	3453
140	Brief of Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations.	3464
141	Brief of Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation.	3513
142	Brief of The National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting.	3556

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1956

HALIFAX, N.S.

SUBMISSIONS BY:

HALIFAX SYMPHONY SOCIETY
Dr. Margaret Gosse
Dr. C. M. Jones

THE MARITIME LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Miss Alberta Letts

THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS
Mr. A. O'Brien
Dr. A. A. Giffin

CANADIAN HOME AND SCHOOL PARENT-TEACHER FEDERATION
Mr. Harold Simpson
Mr. Willis M. Hall

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL BROADCASTING
Dr. H. P. Moffatt
Mr. T. V. Dobson

--On resuming at 10,30 A.M.:

SUBMISSION OF THE
HALIFAX SYMPHONY SOCIETY

Appearances:

Dr. Margaret Gosse

Dr. C. M. Jones

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we can open today's hearings now, and I should perhaps repeat what I said yesterday about the procedure. We like those who are presenting briefs to file them and either read them or outline them, and then we have questions which are asked for the purpose of bringing out the facts and finding out exactly what the submissions are. I have said it many times, but I will say it again, that no question should be taken as indicating any conclusions by the Commission or on behalf of the Commission.

The first brief we have is from the Halifax Symphony Society, and I understand that Dr. Margaret Gosse, a member of the Board of the Society, will present that brief, and there may be others with her.

DR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, I am Dr. Jones and I am Vice-President of the Society, and I would like to present to you Dr. Margaret Gosse.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and we will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 138.

A
Hal
6/20

EXHIBIT NO. 138: Brief of the Halifax Symphony Society.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you now proceed to present it. I don't know whether you were here yesterday, Dr. Gosse, but we proceed either by reading or by outlining the brief, whichever seems best to you.

DR. GOSSE: I think perhaps it might be better in this case if I read it. It is not very long, and the points are a little difficult to outline.

The Halifax Symphony Society consists of about 750 subscribers to the concerts of the Halifax Symphony Orchestra. As elected representatives of this organization we beg to submit the following considerations. It is our feeling that this group is a significant fraction of the local social order and yet one which is not ordinarily given to self-expression where its own tastes are concerned. It is, we think, quite likely that people who do not care for symphonic music say so much more frequently and vehemently than its lovers tell of their joy and pleasure. But it is not safe to assume that because the latter are mute they do not exist, or even that they constitute a minority.

Neither is it to be taken for granted that the numbers in either category are fixed. No authenticated instances of symphony lovers foreswearing their allegiance spring to mind. It does

A
Hal
6/20

happen from time to time, however, that a taste for the music produced by a symphony orchestra is acquired, even after years of indifference or actual dislike.

For these groups we speak, and, as self-appointed advocates, perhaps we may voice the feelings of a larger section, one of really unknown proportions. These are they who, for one reason or another, do not attend concerts but who do possess extensive record libraries and who never miss a symphony concert on the radio. By their very nature they have no representatives to speak for them.

On behalf of all these, then, we make the following submission: that the CBC should continue, and, indeed, expand, its policy of devoting a generous share of programme budget and time to broadcasting on radio and television symphonic and orchestral music, both traditional and modern, by Canadian and other composers, and suitable for orchestras of different sizes.

Many good reasons could be advanced to support this position. We will confine ourselves to a few of the most important.

The production of symphonic music is expensive, relatively at least. The small, privately owned station is unlikely to spend a sizeable fraction of its budget to broadcast live orchestral music. For one thing sponsors tend to want the most for the least. The large, publicly owned system, on the other hand, has relatively more time

to give to non-commercial programming, and having a more generous budget, can and should afford the outlay for this kind of music. One cannot but be aware of the pressures exerted by groups of enthusiasts of widely varied and divergent points of view, and one can even shed a sympathetic tear for the programme director, who must sometimes feel that he can never hope to please even a few of the people, even part of the time. Nevertheless, just because of the likelihood that there may be less public and financial support for symphonic than for popular music, there is all the more reason for the publicly owned broadcasting system to cherish and nurture everything pertaining to the life and growth of the more elaborate musical form.

Music itself is an abstract term. To consider it as such is to venture into the field of philosophy, and, as enchanting as it may be to meditate upon the soundness of Keats' theory that "heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard are sweeter," we must refrain and deal rather with more practical aspects. It may be said for simplicity's sake that to have music there must be a composer who "finds out musical tunes", a musician who recreates the composer's thought in actual sound, and an audience that hears. Each is indispensable.

Let us consider first composers, past and present. In former days these received support from patrons in return for services rendered.

A
Hal
6/20

That this system of private enterprise was not an unsuccessful one is shown in the rich treasure of classical music that we enjoy today. Even so, it was sometimes years before a composition was heard by more than the very few. And we can never know how many flowers were "born to blush unseen". Today the vast private fortunes have been taxed almost out of existence, and those that remain are subject to demands from sources unthought of in the days of Mozart. It is clear, therefore, that the composer must find his simple needs, namely, money enough to live on and a chance to have his music performed and heard, supplied from other sources. A definite obligation rests upon those who now control the money available to be spent, to see that the music of living composers reaches an audience soon enough and often enough. Public acceptance may come late or never, but the opportunity should be there. Among living composers our own Canadian representatives should receive special consideration.

We turn next to the musicians who produce the sounds. Here is a multiplicity of instruments and skills. Symphonic music is made by many different instruments sounding together, in other words by an orchestra. Such a complicated machine cannot be called into being at a moment's notice. It must be built and modified, trained and refined, until it is capable of translating a musical score into the finest expression of the composer's thought. Continuity is essential and

for an orchestra to retain its members they must be well paid and as well satisfied as may be. Discontent breeds disharmony. A further obligation, therefore, on the custodians of public monies, is to contribute to the support of a reasonable number of orchestral groups of suitable size and quality.

Another smaller group of musicians merits consideration. We refer to solo or concert artists, many of whom, and instrumentalists in particular, need to be heard against the background of an orchestra. Canada has many such talented young artists who should never need to go elsewhere to be heard at their best.

Last but by no means least there is the listener and his willing or unwilling ear. As we hinted in an earlier paragraph, an audience, at least the unseen one of radio and television, is like an iceberg, nine tenths submerged, and with the other tenth in evidence only when it "points with pride or views with alarm". A broad and generous imagination is needed to provide for its needs and wants. To say, as has been said by some, that lovers of symphonic music should content themselves with attending concerts, and should not expect the music of their choice on radio or television, is to take a narrow and selfish view. The fact that it is given only to the fortunate few to attend concerts in the flesh is the best argument for continuing and increasing the number of such

concerts on radio and television. The living orchestra may be many miles away and inaccessible but radio and television can make a concert hall out of the humblest living room.

Finally may we offer an argument that may appear vague and intangible, but which, nonetheless, should carry great weight. Symphonic music with all its wealth of colour and variety of form enhances the splendour of the Canadian scene. This is a rich and growing country. Our development in the field of the arts should keep pace with our industrial and economic advance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Gosse. Do either of you wish to add anything at this time?

DR. GOSSE: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COYNE: Dr. Gosse, you mention in several places in your brief the desirability of continuing and increasing the number of concerts on radio and television: in your view is there any difference between radio and television as media for the broadcast of concerts, of orchestras or instrumentalists?

DR. GOSSE: I can best answer that by quoting an incident which occurred in the past spring here, when a concert by the Halifax Symphony Orchestra was televised. There was a rather nent Halifax citizen who had always claimed he did not know the difference between God Save the Weasel and Pop Goes the Queen, and his wife told me that the night this concert was televised he

A
Mal
6/20

sat absolutely transfixed watching it, and she said that was the first time he had shown any interest in symphonic music. I have no opinions on the subject much because I haven't seen many televised concerts, but that is just a little incident that perhaps shows that some audiences may find the televised concerts more interesting than the broadcast ones.

MR. COYNE: This was someone who really hadn't had any interest in music?

DR. GOSSE: Who really had not.

MR. COYNE: It has been suggested to us in some places that as far as orchestral concerts are concerned not only does television not add anything, but that it can be a positive disadvantage because of the distraction from the music occasioned by seeing the orchestra or seeing the soloist constantly before you on the screen: would you have any comments on a proposition of that kind?

DR. GOSSE: I think that the best answer to that is that if that were absolutely true, nobody would go to concerts. They would stay at home and play records.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there is an added point that has been made to us, which is that television technique, having the camera attempt to keep some motion going and wandering about over the orchestra, is different from sitting in one spot and viewing the whole stage. The other point that is obvious is that the costs of producing television are immensely greater than producing on radio, and

A
Fal
6/20

if you have to search pretty hard for any improvement in the more expensive medium, you naturally wonder whether it is worth the effort.

DR. GOSSE: Well, I think -- and perhaps I ought to be frank -- we included television in every case where we mentioned broadcasting simply because we felt it should not be left out. I don't believe we have any fixed opinions about the one as opposed to the other, but it is a new thing here and we felt if we confined ourselves to radio there would be those who would say that we were discriminating against television.

MR. COYNE: Just one further question arising out of the illustration which you gave a moment ago: do you think there may be any difference, in connection with this point, between music lovers in the sense of people who are accustomed to listening, say, followers of concert music, and the neophyte, who is not really a music lover and is seeing symphonic music for the first time on a TV screen?

DR. GOSSE: Perhaps Dr. Jones would care to answer that.

DR. JONES: I don't know if I quite understand what you mean.

MR. COYNE: Well, the suggestion is that radio serves equally well, or even better, than television as a medium for broadcasting symphonic music to those accustomed music lovers, if you like. Dr. Gosse's illustration was given of a man who did not know the difference between Pop Goes the

A
Eal
5/

Weasel and God Save the Queen, and I take it from her illustration that his suggestion was that television was a medium which attracted him to symphonic music whereas it may not have attracted someone who was accustomed to it?

DR. JONES: I think probably a music lover who knows his music and scores will sit back with his eyes shut and listen. For instance, in our Symphony Society we started about four years ago and we had an audience of about 125, or maybe 100. At the last concert we had in this year's season we had 1000, and it was amazing the number of children, young people, who were up in the balcony -- school kids and early college kids. They had never seen a symphony orchestra, and they were attracted by the motion and dexterity of the players, and the way the conductors brought out this part and that part, and in that way they have got familiar with the music. We hear a little more comment about our broadcasting on the radio now that people have seen the orchestra.

THE CHAIRMAN: This could be an expensive technique for converting the uninitiated?

DR. GOSSE: Exceedingly.

DR. JONES: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us something about the ways, if any, in which the CBC has contributed to the Halifax Symphony Orchestra?

DR. JONES: There would not have been a symphony orchestra without CBC. We don't have sufficient musicians in Halifax. We have to

A
Hal
5/20

import two-thirds of our musicians from Canada or the nearest States, and to offer them employment for twenty-two weeks we have to have regular broadcasts on the air otherwise we could not pay for them. We do our best; we have contributions and we have a local concert, but you know how much musicians cost, and the CBC carries a large part of our budget. We broadcast twenty-two concerts a season in the Maritimes, and this year, because the quality of our orchestra was improved sufficiently, it now goes on the Eastern network and has been heard as far as Toronto, and people listen to it because we have suddenly had a number of musicians writing in and saying, "Can I come and play in your orchestra? It sounds good". If there had not been the CBC support there would have been no orchestra in Halifax.

DR. GOSSE: We get financial support and we get the popularizing effects of broadcasting which interest people in music.

THE CHAIRMAN: And which brings you in subscribers?

DR. GOSSE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The CBC carries about twenty concerts a year?

DR. JONES: About twenty concerts a season we broadcast.

DR. GOSSE: We have had as many as twenty-six.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the nature of the financial support that the CBC gives? How does it

A
Hal
6/20

support?

DR. JONES: They have a budget of a certain sum of money and they say, "There is your budget. You will put on as many concerts as you can within your budget." We broadcast every Friday night. Do you want figures?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you wish.

DR. JONES: Fifteen thousand dollars was the amount that was spent on the Halifax Symphony Society. It is a special grant and we have had some little talk with the Musicians' Union, when it was explained this was a grant that was to be spent only on symphonic music, and that if there was no symphony orchestra then there would be no grant, and we had to put on the very best concerts we could for twenty-two weeks, or twenty-four or twenty weeks, depending. Sometimes we stayed within our budget and sometimes the programmes were a little heavier and the Symphony Society had to pay for the extra musicians. Still, it all went into the budget and enabled us to get the musicians here, otherwise there isn't enough here to attract and pay for musicians. We use all we have in the city, and then we import the rest from Ontario or Quebec, or wherever we can get them.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about your director or conductor; is he a permanent employee?

DR. JONES: He is a permanent conductor from year to year.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the full season?

DR. JONES: Yes. Mr. Waddington comes down and conducts one public concert. We like to see him, and he is a nice man.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: These are public concerts? They are not produced in the studio itself?

DR. JONES: No, these are the public ---

DR. GOSSE: They are studio concerts that are broadcast; they are not public.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They are not public?

DR. GOSSE: No.

DR. JONES: Then there are the concerts at the Queen Elizabeth Hall.

THE CHAIRMAN: And those are not broadcast?

DR. JONES: No.

DR. GOSSE: It would be exceedingly expensive to broadcast them because we would have to pay twice; we pay for the live concert and you pay for the radio concert at the same time.

DR. JONES: The Union has a little added stab; $5 per musician if this is broadcast.

DR. GOSSE: Another thing about it is that they are not suitable because they would not fit into the timing. I know they do the big symphonies, but they just take the first or second half of the programme.

MR. COYNE: Do you receive any financial support from any other organization, or from the city or province?

DR. JONES: From both the city and the

province. It has been small in the past because there was a sort of sceptical eye on this symphony society. There had never been a symphony orchestra here, I don't think, in thirty years, and that was purely am amateur group. This last year the city's grant was substantially raised because it was a good orchestra. Mr. Waddington says it is the fourth best orchestra in Canada in quality; not in size, but in quality, and the city grant has been raised, and the provincial goverrment grant has also been raised, and they pay us for doing school concerts. We do thirty school concerts a year during the season. We travel all over the province and do school concerts in every little hamlet or village. Put a group of people in, and wherever there is a big enough stage to play on we do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who pays for that?

DR. JONES: The Province pays part, and the Home and School of the school we play at pays part. The province pays the bigger slice.

THE CHAIRMAN: So between your $15,000 grant from the CBC, your subscriptions and other forms of private contribution, and your city and provincial grants, including those for school broadcasts, that is the source of your funds, completely?

DR. JONES: And the Women's Auxiliary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which is another form of private contribution?

DR. JONES: Yes.

A
Pal
6/3

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do any of the private radio stations here carry your concerts?

DR. JONES: We tried to work some kind of deal and there is some possibility, but we never get anywhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: This may be a difficult question for you to answer, but I am asking it because of the suggestion that was made to us at one of our hearings that there was a definite centralization trend for musicians -- they tend to go to central places where there are good conservatories and good opportunities, and I think the suggestion was that if you want to get the best music on the air you really have to have music produced in these central places, that this is almost inevitable. Can you give us any judgments that you have had as to the absolute quality that is achieved over not the first year, but over a period of time; how do you think your performance ranks? That may be difficult to answer.

DR. JONES: I can just quote Mr. Waddington, the programme director, and he said in his opinion this is the fourth ranking orchestra in Canada in quality -- not size. We don't have a big orchestra -- twenty-five to thirty players, but they are good players, and Mr. Myers says he could play anything within their capabilities. They won't put on the Ninth Symphony which requires sixty players, but all the instruments are there. We don't have four oboes and five clarinets. In

four years we have slowly achieved that. The first season we practially had to coerce the programme director to put us on the air at all. It was the only thing that saved us, and he was quite worried whether it would be a flop, but it was all right. The second year he bought it without any trouble, and the third year it was a standing thing -- there were no mistakes, or anything. The fourth year -- that is, the present season -- it was extended without asking to Eastern Canada up to Toronto and Quebec and that area. We didn't need to ask; it was good enough to go on. So that we achieved increase in quality and, of course, as it increases in quality it attracts more musicians from places like Toronto and Montreal where there are lots of musicians, and always a lot left over, but good musicians drift to the smaller places the moment the quality improves.

DR. GOSSE: I don't think that is quite the answer you are looking for, Mr. Chairman, is it?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

DR. GOSSE: What you want to know is whether, if we were faced with a choice of spending all the money in one centre and having absolutely superlative music, or whether we think it is better to spend it in the local areas ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like your comments on it looked at from the standpoint that our task is to make some appraisal of programming content

A
Fal
6/20

in relation to finance. Well, actually, it is the other way round: we have to report on finances in relation to programme content. As a Commission dealing with this, we would like any help you can give us on the relative values to a broadcasting system of an actual programme of the, as you say, absolutely superlative, but necessarily centralized in origination, or the kind of building up in different places, and probably not quite as high quality and possibly at higher expense. You may get less total music the second way.

DR. GOSSE: It is a little difficult to answer that question, and try to keep the local and personal prejudice out of it. We, of course, feel very strongly biased in one direction which is that we think there should be local orchestras and that they should go on the air, but I do think, trying to separate in my mind the general from the particular, I really do honestly believe that there is a place for the music of the smaller and local orchestra. For instance, it is not very common to have some of the smaller compositions played with a big orchestra. When they play they want to use the whole orchestra, and therefore they tend to do the massive pieces. For instance, Dr. Boyd Neel's orchestra, which is a smaller group they have been using on a particular concert. Granted, they are in Toronto, but nevertheless they could be anywhere, and I truly think there is a place for small orchestras, and that they should be as

good as they can be made, but they still should be there and that there is a gain in having them.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is really to try and get you to state these gains. The centralizing, that branch is fairly simple: you get higher quality productions and you probably get them either at a cheaper rate or more of them if you just concentrate in one place and produce really top-flight music. Now, what are the gains on the other side, in your experience?

DR. JONES: A local audience would listen more to our own orchestra because they know us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that means a gain, assuming the love of music is a good thing, of more people loving music in the local area.

DR. GOSSE: This is an exceedingly difficult question, and we would probably be wiser if we didn't attempt to answer it, but I can think of an odd thing: for instance, last season there was a local musical production done here called The Broken Ring, and the composer was local and so was the orchestra, and I think it had more interest than if it had been produced centrally.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the kind of thing I am thinking of.

DR. GOSSE: That is all I can scrape up on the spur of the moment, but I do think that is an illustration.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about the degree to which there is, to use a loose phrase, a greater

interest in music in Halifax since your Society has been going?

DR. GOSSE: I feel there is no doubt about it.

DR. JONES: There are now ten times the listeners that we had when we first started. We started with one hundred and now we have one thousand, and a lot of young people. It is fine to talk about the financial end in black and white, but if we don't have the CBC we don't have an orchestra, and we don't have school concerts. You have to see a school concert out in the sticks where six or seven hundred school kids and old people and young people pour in, and they just love it. They have never seen anything before like that, and in that way you can't talk about finances.

MR. COYNE: Dr. Gosse, I take it from your brief that you are not making any recommendations for any changes in the overall structure of broadcasting in Canada? Your Society is limiting itself to the recommendation you make on page 1?

DR. GOSSE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: "Continue to expand its policy"?

DR. GOSSE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have a couple of questions. Near the top of page 2 you are talking about the fact that symphonic music is expensive, and you say that the small privately owned station cannot spend very much on live orchestral music,

A
Hal
6/8

and then you say, "The large, publicly owned system, on the other hand, has relatively more time to give to non-commercial programming, and having a more generous budget, can and should afford the outlay for this kind of music." What makes you think the CBC has a more generous budget?

DR. GOSSE: Perhaps that was an unwarranted assumption.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have had some suggestion from the CBC that their budget is not by any means the sort of thing they need to carry on.

DR. GOSSE: I think perhaps the root of that lies in a very widespread public impression, which may be wrong, which is that if you are spending public money you have always got lots of money to spend.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is one of the reasons I asked the question. Then, on pages 3 and 4 -- there are two places where you say-- and this is near the top of page 3 -- "A definite obligation rests upon those who now control the money available to be spent to see that the music of living composers reaches an audience soon enough and often enough." Then down below you say, "A further obligation, therefore, on the custodians of public moneys, is to contribute to the support of a reasonable number of orchestral groups of suitable size and quality." On your fourth page you say, "Symphonic music with all its wealth of colour and variety of form enhances the splendour of the Canadian scene." I

A
Hal
6/2

an see that last argument as to the value to Canada of good music, I can see an argument that this is what a substantial audience wants, I can see the argument even that this is what an audience would come to want if it knew more about it, but I don't see this "obligation" argument. You seem to be saying that this is an expensive thing, it cannot be supported by ordinary means, here is a government agency with money and it should be spent on this. Well, where do you stop? Do you go into the same argument applying to plays and ballet, and, to make it absurd, something like polo, which is an expensive game, and people maybe would like to see it, therefore public money should be spent on that?

DR. GOSSE: Well, the origin of that argument is in the bottom paragraph on page 2, in which reference is made to the wealthy patrons of former days engaging the services of composers to write concertos and so on for the wedding of the daughter, and all that. I think we all realize these days the very wealthy people pay a lot of taxes and big private fortunes are also subject to heavy demands by death duties. A further point is that in the days when musicians and composers were supported by private patrons there were no charitable campaigns, and these other demands on money were not there. Now, the money has changed hands to some extent, and by taxation in one form or another the money is in the hands of people I refer to as "custodians of public

money", and to some extent it is our feeling that they should take over the function of those patrons who looked after the situation many years ago.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us test that: take these wealthy people of former times; they used to build castles; you would not suggest some public agency should build castles? Perhaps the architects would.

DR. GOSSE: I think it is possible to discriminate to some extent between the desirability of one project as against another. I am bound to admit one sometimes wonders -- charitable organizations get set up today to do the oddest things, and I have always expected one would form some day to provide children with pink complexions. Still the validity of some as against others presents itself to some extent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't ask these questions to indicate any disagreement with the desirability of orchestral music. I was really raising the question as to the validity of this being based on obligation. I wonder if there is the obligation on the State. It may be desirable to produce it because it is desirable in itself.

DR. GOSSE: Perhaps "obligation" is too strong a word. I couldn't suggest a substitute offhand. I am afraid I would stick at "obligation", myself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I may be quibbling to some extent with your actual wording, but I do

A
Hal
6/20

hink it may be important to make the point that ust because there is a large organization with an .pparently large budget does not necessarily mean here is money available for all demands.

DR. GOSSE: I think there is some public acceptance of the idea. For instance, in Britain there is the Arts Council, and we do hope some day we may have some such thing not on the national scale but locally here. I might even mention some of the conclusions of the Massey Report which bolster up the idea that there are some valid ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is what was in my mind in asking these questions, and it comes down to this: Do you think that the CBC should, in effect, constitute itself as an Arts Council?

DR. GOSSE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is what your argument really comes to?

DR. GOSSE: Yes, in the absence of a present Arts Council. It is true an ordinary Arts Council could do things which could not fall into the orbit of the CBC. They include painters and people like that, but, nevertheless, in so far as the ground is covered I think the CBC is part of an Arts Council at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: It does complicate its functions very greatly.

DR. GOSSE: I agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it also complicates our task for working out financial arrangements.

DR. JONES: It is life and death to this orchestra.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very glad to have had your brief and we thank you for presenting it so well.

DR. GOSSE: Thank you.

- - - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
THE MARITIME LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Appearance:

Miss Alberta Letts

- - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is from The Maritime Library Association. Miss Letts is the Chairman and she will present the brief. Miss Letts, your brief will be marked as Exhibit No. 139.

EXHIBIT NO. 139: Brief of The Maritime Library Association

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please present it as you choose?

MISS LETTS: First of all I would like to say I am representing The Maritime Library Association. When it was announced that the Commission on Radio and Broadcasting was to be set up the Executive of the Association met in Halifax and considered its implications for libraries and they appointed a committee of the four Atlantic

A
Hal
6/20

Provinces to prepare a brief, with myself as chairman. At the time we submitted the brief we expected I would be accompanied by the president and vice-president of the Association, but there has been a conflict of dates with the meeting of the Canadian Library Association in Ontario, and consequently I appear alone. However, at the annual meeting of the Association held last month I was given authority to represent the members and present this brief which was prepared and considered by a large and, I think, representative number of members of the Association. This brief is supplementary to the one presented by the Canadian Library Association a few weeks ago. We wanted to endorse that brief in its recommendations for Canada, but we felt we would like to go a little further to emphasize certain problems that were relative to the Maritimes and to underline some of the points made in the larger presentation.

I believe we are concerned mainly with the two points on coverage and quality, both of which depend upon the economic status of the CBC. We regret we have no solutions to these problems to offer. In fact, the things we ask for would seem to intensify them because they ask for more money.

I hadn't intended to read the brief as I thought you probably would be familiar with it, but if there are any questions arising from it, I should be glad to try to answer them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: As you said in your

A
Hal
C/Eu

summary, your Association complains that the programmes are too few in number and not of sufficient quality: could you tell us if you have any statistics indicating the number of hours either weekly or monthly of programmes dealing with or referring to the problem of books and reading?

MISS LETTS: You mean in the Maritimes?

MR. de GRANDPRE: How many programmes?

MISS LETTS: You mean statistics covering the Maritimes?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes.

MISS LETTS: I don't think that would be possible because the same programmes are not heard in the four Atlantic provinces, and that comes back to the question of coverage. For instance, in Fredericton, which has not a CBC station, they would not hear the same programmes that we would hear in Halifax, and the same would be true in Newfoundland.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am referring now to the CBC programmes -- the programmes carried by CBC stations, whether in Halifax or in Moncton.

MISS LETTS: No, I don't think I can give you statistics on that. I think I can probably list on one hand the number of programmes that would be heard in the week that would deal particularly with books.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And that would represent how many hours per week?

MISS LETTS: I don't think it would cover

more than -- right now I can't think of more than possibly two or three hours; that is, adult and children.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is every week?

MISS LETTS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That includes radio and television?

MISS LETTS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you sincerely feel that more than three hours a week should be devoted to programmes related to books and reading?

MISS LETTS: Yes, I do sincerely. In fact, you have emphasized the three hours, and I think I set that figure a little high.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You must realize the number of hours is rather limited in a week, and you have to cater to minorities -- all minorities?

MISS LETTS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you have to broadcast for music lovers, drama lovers, soap opera lovers, and there is a limit to the number of hours that the CBC can afford to give to these minorities.

MISS LETTS: You are quite sure book lovers come in the minorities group?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, whether it is a minority or not, I think Mr. de Grandpre is putting to you the basic problem of achieving a balance in the programming against a great number of competing and sometimes of insistent claimants,

A
Fal
6/20

and that this is all healthy enough but with two or three hours a week devoted to books what kind of test do you use to see whether that is too much or not enough?

MISS LETTS: I think possibly when I said two or three hours it means that I as a librarian have studied the CBC times to catch every programme that might concern books and reading, and in that I have included plays and drama and talks that would be of interest. Because of that, I do catch more of them than possibly the average listener or viewer, and I do not think that is too great a proportion.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you have any idea of the number of listeners for these programmes?

MISS LETTS: No, I am sorry, I haven't.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you notice after a programme of that nature has been on the air that there is a greater demand for particular books in the library? If there is a review of a book put on the air does the demand for that book increase?

MISS LETTS: Definitely, I would say. The morning after "Critically Speaking" on Monday morning, if we have missed the programme I think we can tell what books were reviewed by the number of requests that come in for those books.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may be in your brief and I have missed it, but is there some tie-up between the library and the radio programme and the book publisher to be sure you have books in

tock or on hand for use by your readers?

MISS LETTS: No, there is no tie-up at the present time, but so far the books that have been used and reviewed I think we nearly always do have.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can conceive of a situation where -- the thing which you are anxious to achieve is to have more people read books?

MISS LETTS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may have a very useful public statement about a book on the air and not have the book available to go out, which would be a pity.

MISS LETTS: That has happened. That did happen in the early days of radio with the children's programmes, Cuckoo Clock House, and at the request of librarians they do now publish the list of books that will be used and we make sure we have them in stock before the programmes come on.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do say, "Broadcasters and librarians would both benefit if the policy of giving advance notice of printed materials used on programmes were more general."

MISS LETTS: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Your brief refers to radio and television, and you refer to the two media in the same sentence, and then you list on page 2 some of the types of programme that could

A
Nat
6/20

e produced, and you say, "Direct narration from ooks", and, "presentation of the writings of ontemporary authors, especially Canadian", and ou include television as a medium to do this: Is t simply an omission that radio should concentrate n narration and presentation of books and television should concentrate on dramatization of books and plays, or do you feel that television is as good a medium for the narration of books?

MISS LETTS: I think it would be. I must admit I am not familiar too much with that type of programme. Television is even younger in the Maritimes than it is in the rest of Canada, and we haven't seen very many programmes of that kind, but I do think it could be used in that way.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I am asking you the question because it has been suggested to us that television is a more expensive medium than radio, and whatever programmes can be produced as well on radio should remain radio programmes leaving television for programmes that lend themselves better to television.

MISS LETTS: I would agree with that. I think, personally, I would prefer the radio presentation and leave the more expensive medium of television for the type of thing it can do better. Where they can be produced equally well I think the radio would be quite satisfactory.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I see your Association

A
1a)
6/20

shows great interest in CBC Times, and you would like circulation increased and you would like the Times to be read by more people. Do you have any comments to make the CBC Times more attractive and more lively and more acceptable to readers, or do you feel it is a good magazine as it is without any improvement?

MISS LETTS: I think it is a good magazine as it is, but I think it definitely needs improving. I would like to see it contain reprints of talks, for instance, that have been given. Material that appears on radio and television is transitory; it disappears. For instance, not long ago Blair Fraser gave a talk on censorship and that affected us quite closely, and it was a very good presentation of that talk. I would like to have had a copy available for use, myself, and on getting in touch with Mr. Fraser he didn't have a copy, nor had the CBC. That material was gone. I thought it was a good article, and if printed in CBC Times it could have been read by more people than heard it, or it could have been used as reference material. When we brought that point up in our brief we were wondering if the CBC Times could not be made more useful by printing articles of that kind. It would be expensive to rebroadcast talks that had been given, but they could be printed.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And you feel the CBC advertises the Times on the air often enough, and do you feel they have an aggressive sale campaign to distribute the Times?

MISS LETTS: I think that has improved lately. I think one of its major advertisers is Rawhide, which gives it a healthy plug now and again; I don't know what result that has in subscriptions. There is a programme here called CBC Times every evening which lists the changes that might be made. Also I think it has made a lot of people familiar with the CBC Times, and I think the subscriptions might have increased as a result of that. I am afraid I don't know what proportion of people use the CBC Times, but I think it is valuable and we do have requests for it in the library, though I don't really believe it is library material.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But it could be made library material if they would print in the Times some of the better talks programmes?

MISS LETTS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have been obviously following the programming, particularly the talks type of programming, and arising from this discussion of publications, you probably know the English publication "The Listener"?

MISS LETTS: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there enough material from what you see of the talks to justify a similar publication here apart from the CBC Times?

MISS LETTS: I don't think apart from the CBC Times, no. I think combining it with the

times that there would be sufficient material.

THE CHAIRMAN: The two functions are somewhat different and they may be difficult, technically, to put together; that is, one is really announcements of the coming programmes and all the variations of time and regional distribution; and the other is a recapitulation of the better things that have gone -- they may not go too well together.

MISS LETTS: No, but, as you suggested, I think there might not be a place or a need for two separate periodicals. I think the one could carry it, and the CBC Times has been doing it recently. They have just published two talks given by Andre Laurendeau. I should like to see that, and that was one of the things we felt quite strongly about in presenting the brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is that these are often very good things that are put out once on the air and gone forever?

MISS LETTS: Yes, and there is another point there too, and that is that sometimes they are heard in parts of Canada but not throughout all Canada. For instance, we don't get the programme "Anthology" down here, which is a little annoying because the accounts of it in the Times sound excellent. They sound like the type of things we are interested in -- book reviews and presentation of writers and Canadian authors, but we don't get it here. While we should like to have it on radio,

aving it reprinted in the Times would help con-siderably.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't you get it here? Is it part of the regular CBC production?

MISS LETTS: It comes on fairly late in the evening, and the CBC stations go off the air at that time. That is not only the programmes on books, but also some of the good music programmes. We see the announcements in the CBC Times at this hour, and ther there is a little note underneath for the Maritimes stations. That, I know, is a problem of coverage.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Miss Letts, for your brief.

MISS LETTS: Thank you, gentlemen.

- - - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
THE NOVA SCOTIA FEDERATION OF
HOME AND SCHOOL ASSOCIATIONS

Appearances:

Mr. A. O'Brien

Dr. A. A. Giffin

- - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of The Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations, and I understand Mr. O'Brien and Dr. Giffin are both here. This will be Exhibit No. 140.

A
Fal
6/2

EXHIBIT NO. 140: Brief of Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand, Mr. O'Brien, that you were the chairman of the committee that worked on the preparation of this brief?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Dr. Giffin is the president of the Home and School Association?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. I think, sir, we would prefer to read the brief.

"The Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations speaks for more than five hundred local Associations spread through every county in this province. These Associations have as members 22,000 men and women who are devoted to the welfare of the children they are endeavouring to educate at home and in school.

"Deeply conscious of the profound possibilities of mass communications media for providing both formal and informal education for our children, either at home or in school, our Federation welcomes this opportunity to submit the following observations and recommendations to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting.

"We are pleased that the Government of Canada in setting up the Royal Commission, included in its terms of reference the positive statement that 'the reconsideration of television broad-

A
Hal
6/30

casting should be based upon the principles that the grant of the exclusive use of certain frequencies or channels for broadcasting shall continue to be under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and that the broadcasting and distribution of Canadian programmes by a public agency shall continue to be the central feature of Canadian broadcasting policy'.

"We are convinced that this system serves best the nation's need for information, education, and entertainment, and encourages a sense of national unity and an appreciation of Canadian culture.

"In our view, the CBC and private stations complement each other. The private stations are meant to serve local community needs while the CBC meets the regional, national, and international requirements of the listening and viewing public. In order for the CBC to fulfill its functions in the costly television field it must have substantially increased financial support and there must be reasonable continuity and security in that support, so that orderly planned development may take place.

"In view of the high cost of television, most Canadian programmes will have to be produced by the CBC or the National Film Board. If Canadian programming were left to the private stations we believe that only the three or four

largest cities would be able to afford good quality programmes. The rural areas and the smaller urban centres would have to rely on imported films and more advertising, with a lack of balance and quality.

"We believe the CBC is making good progress in the development of a substantial variety of high quality Canadian programmes. It must be given the finances which will permit it to achieve the same high standards in television which it has achieved in radio. Its Canadian programmes should of course be supplied to private as well as to public stations.

"The licensing, regulation, and control of all radio and television stations should continue to be a responsibility of the Board of Governors of the CBC acting on behalf of the people of Canada. We believe, however, that some reorganization in the affairs of the CBC may be necessary in order to make it clear to the public that the programme department of the Corporation is not charged with regulating private stations and is not competing with them as much as it is servicing them. If there is to be an independent regulatory body, it should only be independent of the programme department, and not of the Board of Governors. Such a body should be given broad and reasonable enforcement powers and instructions to use them in the public interest.

"Any regulatory body outside the Board of Governors of the CBC would, in our view, involve some

A
Hal
6/20

duplication of work and thus represent unnecessary additional expense. Since the regulation of television and radio broadcasting is to remain 'under the control of the Parliament of Canada', we believe that control can best be exercised through the Board of Governors of the CBC.

"In view of the fact that we have two major language groups in Canada, and that our population is spread thinly over a vast area, it is inevitable that radio and television broadcasting will remain a much more costly venture here than it is in countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. Hence we believe that in order to make the best use of limited resources, an order of priorities ought to be established. First priority should go to complete coverage for all Canadians of sound broadcasting of CBC network programmes. Second priority should be given to reasonably complete coverage of television broadcasting in black and white. The third and last priority should go to colour television which we feel is a luxury which can be withheld until the first two priorities are met.

"These priorities are important when, in a small province like Nova Scotia, there are areas out of range not only of television but of CBC radio transmission. In order to assure value for money spent through the CBC, we recommend that CBC radio and television stations be given adequate

A
Hal
6/20

power, and in the case of radio, popular locations on the dial.

"At the present time the Trans-Canada network is provided for Nova Scotia listeners through private stations at Bridgewater, New Glasgow, and St. John, New Brunswick, and through CBC stations at Halifax, Sydney and Sackville, New Brunswick. In the day time these stations do not provide complete coverage of Guysborough, Antigonish, Yarmouth, Inverness and Cape Breton counties. At night, when there is additional interference from other stations, the Trans-Canada network coverage is further reduced in Digby, Annapolis, Shelburne and Halifax counties. With additional financing, the CBC could provide complete coverage of both the Trans-Canada and Dominion networks throughout the province. The use of unattended low wattage transmitters in smaller communities is one technique which could be used.

"We believe it is important that more than fifty per cent of the programmes presented on television and radio be Canadian in origin. The main prerequisite for meeting this goal is adequate financing for the CBC. It has been proven in radio that Canada can produce the talent and the creative direction for good programming. If the funds are available to the CBC, we believe the same will be true of television.

"We commend the CBC's policy of decentralized programme production and the establishment

of regional production centres. The development of Canadian talent on a regional basis is conducive to greater understanding between our two major language groups, between urban and rural inhabitants, and among people of diverse economic and geographic backgrounds.

"We recommend that the CBC be enabled financially to institute an information service dealing with employment opportunities in broadcasting. Young Canadians in school and university, and Canadians generally, should be made fully aware of career possibilities in administrative, technical, programme and other areas of broadcasting work.

"The National Film Board's documentary films have received merited praise. We recommend that part of the television programme in Canada involve an expansion of the work of the National Film Board. Increased output will create greater opportunity for the development of Canadian talent and provide a training ground for television personnel.

"We suggest that good television programmes be filmed and made available for distribution through the National Film Board. This might produce some additional revenue for the CBC.

"Even though a majority of our television programmes be Canadian in origin, the balance should not come from one country only. We suggest that there are valuable possibilities in drawing programmes from a wide variety of countries.

A
Bal
6/20

"Foreign television programmes could be filmed, given English subtitles, and used by the CBC. This would save money in Canadian television production costs. As a Federation, we are interested further that Canadians be given every possible constructive opportunity to learn more about life in other countries. A selection of the best of foreign productions would help to sustain a high level of television in Canada and make Canadians more informed and appreciative of foreign cultures and peoples. An exchange system would afford opportunities for Canadian films and television programmes to enter foreign countries, thus promoting abroad an appreciation of our own country, its resources and achievements, and a furtherance of international good will.

"It is possible that an agency like U. N. Radio might be developed for this purpose.

"Quality should be a major concern in the development of all programmes. It should be given particular attention where children's programmes are concerned.

"Television affords us a remarkable educational opportunity for influencing the development of our children and thereby affecting the future of our nation. Such a responsibility is not to be taken lightly. In children's programmes especially, quality must not take second place to economy.

A
Hal
6/20

"As an essential safeguard for our children, the Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations would like to see an extension of research leading to more effective and broader use of television among all children and young people. This includes research covering the pre-school years, since children will watch and be influenced by television long before they can read (even before they can talk); it includes research covering the school-age period, resulting in more TV programmes planned especially in relation to the interests of various age levels and to the school curriculum; and it includes research covering the 'drop-out' years, which would result in programmes planned to meet the special needs and interests of the fifty per cent of our adolescents who have left school before the end of Grade IX.

"This kind of study is, in our opinion, fundamental to ensuring the best, most creative and responsible use of television in programmes designed especially for children. We suggest that this should be the major function of a regularly established department, with an adequate budget for thorough and extensive research, and the economic security which is required for long-term planning.

"We feel, moreover, that all children's programmes, whether national or local, on public or private TV, should come under the supervision of

A
Hal
(/2

persons who have considerable training in child development and mental health, and experience in other fields of work with children. With this training and experience as background, and with the co-operation of the research department, such persons could ensure that the CBC would play a truly responsible role in television programming for children.

"The Commission will understand that we take a serious view of the harm which may be done by undesirable programmes for children, and, that conversely we believe that television has tremendous positive possibilities for children of all ages. We commend the CBC for experiments which have already been carried on in the field of school use of TV and which have already impressed many teachers with the unique contribution to the school curriculum which can be made by this medium. We urge that this programme be extended to include a wide variety of subjects and more range in the age of viewers.

"The objective should be to develop an effective Television School Programme, comparable in purpose and coverage to that of the National School Radio Broadcasts.

"We feel it is particularly true in the field of children's TV that no hard and fast line can be drawn between educational and entertaining programmes. For children, the more entertaining a show is, in the sense that it is a pleasure

A
Hal
5/20

to watch it and that it holds the viewer's interest, the more probable it is that ideas and attitudes will be absorbed by watching it. Programmes designed purely for entertainment are bound to teach something, and, in fact, may teach more effectively than so-called educational programmes. This factor alone emphasizes the need for research.

"People who are responsible for the production of children's programmes should know what effect television is having on a child's values, for example, his sense of fair play and reasonableness, his loyalty and love of truth, his concept of the dignity and brotherhood of man; on his feelings of fear and anxiety, or security and trust; on his appreciation of the work of beauty and of science, of music, books, art, and history; on his understanding of people of other races and creeds; on his imagination and desire for exploring further the mysterious realms of the unknown.

"While an international television service is important in adult programmes, we feel it is particularly relevant for children's viewing, and recommend that the CBC explore the possibilities of the exchange of special programmes for children, possibly through UNESCO.

"We have already referred to the large group of young people, one-half the total of that age group, who have left school before the end of

A
Hal
1/2

Grade IX. We suggest that the CBC, through its research department,and with the co-operation of schools, universities, and other agencies of adult education and recreation, could plan a really significant programme appropriate to the needs of this particular group. We would like to see a pilot project of this sort undertaken in Nova Scotia, where the need is great, and where we believe that the universities, government departments and private agencies would be happy to co-operate.

"We recognize the responsibility of parents for setting standards in their own homes on the appropriateness for their children of programmes which are designed for adult viewing. We feel, however, that certain periods each day should be planned especially for children's viewing, and suggest that Sunday afternoon be considered a suitable period for viewing by the whole family.

"In view of the high cost of television it will be necessary to support the operations of the CBC both through parliamentary grants and through advertising.

"While admitting the need for advertising revenues, we believe that detailed regulations governing it must be promulgaged and enforced. These regulations must ensure that advertising is not offensive, inaccurate, too lengthy, or too frequent. For instance, we do not believe a half-hour programme need be interrupted in the middle

when there is time for advertising at the beginning and the end.

"We further object to the kind of advertising which urges children to coax their parents to buy a particular brand of some product or which makes extravagant claims about the healthful benefits of chewing a certain brand of gum. We would prefer to see the children's programmes presented either on a sustaining basis or with institutional advertising.

"We submit that it is a special responsibility of the CBC to provide programmes for minority listeners and viewers, since as a national body, supported by public funds, the CBC must strive to meet a multiplicity of listening and viewing needs. Some programmes regarded highly by our Federation do not lend themselves readily to commercial sponsorship and hence require support from public funds. We commend programmes of this type which have appeared already, such as CBC Wednesday Night, Citizens' Forum, serious music, literature, and talks programmes. Some of these do not have a listening audience large enough to attract sponsorship and financial support from commercial advertisers. We feel, however, that the CBC should have sufficient funds to produce more programmes of this kind.

"We believe that the listening and viewing audience of such programmes could be increased through greater programme publicity. The

CBC Times is a natural vehicle for such publicity. We recommend that this publication be given more forceful advertisement through radio and television and that it be made a truly pervasive means of communication.

"In carrying on an expensive operation like television broadcasting, every effort must be made to keep costs within reason, without defeating the objectives of our national system. One method of reducing costs is the repetition of the CBC's better programmes at different hours or on different evenings. We do not believe it is necessary to present new shows at every hour. There are many groups of people, including shift workers, invalids, and just plain busy people, who would appreciate repeats on shows they have missed because of timing.

"We believe that a major source of the CBC's revenue must be statutory grants from the Parliament of Canada. They should be guaranteed annual grants for at least a five-year period in order to provide a sound base for programme planning. The amounts of these grants should be sufficient to meet the costs involved in the various recommendations we are making today.

"In conclusion, the Nova Scotia Federation of Home and School Associations commends the CBC for its achievements in radio and television and for the manifest creativity that has made Canada a principal production centre in world

A
Hal
6/20

television. There are vast possibilities for the good of the Canadian nation in the further development of Canadian television. Handled wisely by an agency whose only goal is the public interest, we believe that great value will come to the people in return for the tax revenues which go to support the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation."

The recommendations at the end are repetition, and therefore I think it is not necessary to read them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Do you want to add anything at this stage?

DR. GIFFIN: Not at this stage, Mr.Chairman.

MR. COYNE: Mr. O'Brien, I would like to ask you a few questions on specific points mentioned in your brief. In the first section of your brief under "Control" you say, near the bottom of the first page:

> "In our view, the CBC and private stations complement each other. The private stations are meant to serve local community needs while the CBC meets the regional, national and international requirements . . ."

I take it from your brief that you support in general terms the present structure of broadcasting in Canada?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: On page 2, towards the

A
Hal
6/20

bottom of the page, you say:

> "We believe, however, that some reorganization in the affairs of the CBC may be necessary in order to make it clear to the public that the programme department of the Corporation is not charged with regulating private stations . . ."

Could you expand a little on the type of reorganization which you feel is desirable?

(Page 3479 follows)

MR. O'BRIEN: It seems to me, and this of course is a personal opinion since the brief as a whole was adopted by our Federation and we can only give our opinion, in expanding on this it seems to me that that is a problem which should be worked out by people who are familiar with the administration of the CBC and radio in Canada. Our point there, it seems to me, is that there is not anything fundamentally wrong with the present set-up but because of the great controversy over the alleged competition and having one of the competitors act as a judge that there needs to be a clarification so the CBC is not constantly getting bad public relations for something which is not fundamentally the way it is made out to be.

MR. COYNE: You feel the matter of the appearance to the public is important?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, that is the point we have made in this paragraph, we feel it is not too serious but if we changed the name of the Board of Governors and made the programmes department responsible to the Board of Governors and a regulating body responsible to this Board, they might make it look as though they were separate and there would not be the appearance of competition with the competitor being the judge, that seems to be there now.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it from what you are saying in your opinion, and, presumably in the

opinion of the group that you speak for, in your opinion you say that this argument based on the CBC being both competitor and regulator is not a valid argument?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not feel that it is and I do not believe that our group feels that it is; otherwise we would not have stated our position in this way. We say in one paragraph that the CBC and the private stations were designed for functions which are complementary and not competitive and we feel the CBC is the basic broadcasting set-up in Canada and the local stations are to fill needs which the CBC is not in a position to fill.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, you say here that the programming department of the Corporation should not be charged with regulating private stations; in other words, that particular department is the only one you think is in competition with the private stations. I think yesterday we heard that there is competition between the two facets of the broadcasting system in the matter of advertising; while it is true one does not go after local advertising, the CBC does not go after local advertising, the private stations feel they are in competition with the CBC for advertising, so if that were the case then this association of departments would require to go further than programming. I think their commercial department, for instance?

B
Nat
6/2

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, the independent regulatory body which some are asking for would surely not in any case be able to call for regulation to find out how much goes to the private stations and how much to the CBC. The same regulation should apply to both private stations and the CBC, and whether the regulatory body is part of the CBC or not, these regulations should be the same for both public and private stations. I think, however, on this point about the programme department, we feel that most Canadians sort of just associate the CBC with the programme department because the CBC produces so many programmes and there is certainly a competition in the programme field and the programme department should not be in the business of regulating; it should be in the business of producing programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, even there -- I am not sure of this and we will have to inquire much more carefully into it -- but take your sentence, the programme department of the Corporation should not be charged with regulating private stations. Well now, if the programme department is responsible, as it appears to be now under the Statute, for producing a national broadcasting service, or, let us call it a national broadcasting programme, and if it proposed to do that national broadcasting programme by way of production and distribution partly through CBC stations and

B
Hal
9/20

partly through private stations, may it not then be necessary that the programme department in programming aspects will have to do some regulating of private stations?

MR. O'BRIEN: It seems to me that the Board of Governors or whoever the regulatory body is would set up the basic framework in which all stations worked. Take a private station like the one here, which is a member of the Dominion network, surely in the general regulations when the station joins a network it is determined how many hours a week they must carry CBC programmes, which type they must have a minimum of, and so on, and then the programme department would merely be responsible for producing the programmes and making them available. The regulations laid down by the regulatory body would determine what the private station that is a member of the network had to take and how it was worked out in administration. It may be that this involves a narrowing of the functions of the programme department, but our point it seems to me is to separate in the public mind the business of producing programmes and the business of regulating radio and television in Canada.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In other words, you are saying, as I take it, that the Board of Governors as such should do the regulating and the executive and administrative officers of the CBC should have nothing to say in that matter; would

you go that far?

MR. O'BRIEN: I would say in your structure of organization you have the Board of Governors at the top and the programme manager -- I do not know his correct title -- is responsible to the Board of Governors. On the other side you have a regulatory body which adopts all the individual regulations and it too is responsible directly to the Board of Governors so that they are in a sense brothers, as they must be anyway, because they are all eventually responsible to the Parliament of Canada, but they would be brothers with equal stature in the eyes of the public.

MR. COYNE: Mr. O'Brien, going on to the next sectionof your brief which is on coverage, how serious is this situation in Nova Scotia that you refer to at the bottom of the page whereby even in radio within the province there are, as you say, quite substantial areas which are not able to receive CBC stations?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, it is serious for the people in those areas who, if they want to hear Citizens'Forum, when the one station in their area is not on the network which carries that programme or any other programme which you might care to name, I think that in this country we can afford to have coverage by two networks in the field of radio that give some choice to the listener.

MR. COYNE: That is, your point is that

for instance, the Trans-Canada network cannot be received by everybody in the province; is that right?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: In these areas that you mention, is that a general situation or is it the fact that the average receiver cannot receive these signals? We heard yesterday concerning the situation in Antigonish which has a relatively low-powered transmitter, and we were told that the reception was not too good south of Antigonish; it may be a directional fault of some kind, but they can hear their station in Newfoundland, throughout Cape Breton, which was the best receiving section, and well up into the North Shore of New Brunswick.

MR. O'BRIEN: I can remember when their station came on the air first and we could get it in Halifax, but we cannot any more.

MR. COYNE: What about outside Halifax, I understand in the cities reception of outside stations is reduced because of the noise generated by electrical apparatus in big cities today, but this is not such a factor on the outside.

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right, and I think the counties that are listed here are counties in which reception is available in part of the county but not in all of the county. Some of these are fairly large in terms of square miles, and Anitigonish county, which is listed there, the

station that you referred to I think is on the Dominion network. These counties that are listed is a reference to the Trans-Canada network.

MR. COYNE: How far is New Glasgow, which has a Trans-Canada transmitter, from Antigonish?

MR. O'BRIEN: Not very far. I would say about forty miles. These counties -- by the way, this information in the paragraphs which list the counties -- that information was supplied to us by the regional office of the CBC here in Halifax and we accept it as being based on reliable information in their hands.

MR. COYNE: Has your Federation ever made any representation to the CBC with regard to what you say is inadequate coverage?

MR. O'BRIEN: Perhaps Dr. Giffin can answer that.

DR. GIFFIN: Not previous to this brief.

MR. O'BRIEN: I recall at a convention a year or so ago there was a question about Kindergarten of the Air not being available in the Antigonish area.

DR. GIFFIN: I think that is correct, but there was no submission made.

MR. O'BRIEN: There was a resolution passed and if it was not forwarded to the CBC it should have been at that time. I am not sure that it was not.

MR. COYNE: Well then, going on to your next section ---

E
Hal
6/20

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, there may be a couple of questions on coverage. On page 3 I notice you have listed three priorities in order as to the approach that should be made in connection with the way money is used. You first give sound broadcasting on a complete coverage of all Canadians; second, reasonably complete coverage in television in black and white, and, third and last, coloured television. Where would you put into this the priority for any public expenditure on second television outlets? This is one of the points that has been put to us a number of times, that there are certain areas in Canada where the public is demanding alternative choice, the market may be large enough to assist in the support of a second television station, and I think you are right in suggesting that money is not unlimited and there has to be some set of priorities, and where would you put this or has it not been considered?

MR. O'BRIEN: It has not been considered directly but by implication it would certainly not come before the first two priorities that we have listed. We have suggested somewhere in the brief that if it were not for certain control over the development of television in Canada we feel that television would be concentrated in the four largest cities, and we are asking as our first priority complete radio coverage, and as our second, complete

television coverage. That seems to me means complete coverage, reasonably complete coverage, on one station or one network in the country as between a second television network and the third priority which we listed as colour television. I do not feel we considered that carefully enough to offer any views.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I take it from what you say that you believe your organization, if there were a choice between using the last $100,000, let us say, that is available for the expansion of television into a new area or for creating an alternative service in an area now covered by one station, your organization would go for a station in a new area?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are there any blanks in Nova Scotia where no radio can be heard, either through private or public stations, do you know?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not know of any and I should think that with an aerial and a reasonably efficient receiver that you could receive sound broadcasting anywhere in this province.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your section on Canadian programmes, you say in the first sentence:

> "We believe it is important that more than fifty per cent of the programmes presented on television and radio be Canadian in origin."

ny fifty per cent?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, we say more than ifty per cent -- I think our feeling is we do not ant the percentage to get too small. There is no agic in the figure fifty per cent; I believe that is he policy of the CBC at the present time, and we feel hat should be the minimum. You may say forty-five er cent or fifty-five per cent or sixty per cent. I o not think we would quibble on the figure but we d ot feel the figure should be around ten per cent or wenty-five per cent. This is an approximate figure.

MR. COYNE: What is the virtue in your ind in a programme merely because it is Canadian part from matters of quality of programme?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, it seems to me that xperience with radio has shown that we have in Canada alent which can produce distinctly Canadian pro- grammes, which are a contribution not only to the education of the people of Canada but to the culture and the unity of the nation as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think you change a little there; you said programmes which are dis- tinctively Canadian. That is a little different from talking about programmes Canadian in origin, is it not?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right, Canadian in origin would allow you a broader field because some of our programmes might be patterned after similar American programmes.

B
H
6,

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you see any importance, is it of any importance to have a tap dancer on television who happens to be a Canadian to anybody except the tap dancer?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not have much interest in tap dancers. It seems to me if you choose an example that has to do with, say, music, which was discussed earlier this morning, there is a valid point in stimulating the development of talent in this [illegible] and in the various regions of the country.

MR. COYNE: Including the talent of tap dancing?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, I would question that, I do not know whether there is any value there or not, but maybe Dr. Giffin has an opinion on it.

DR. GIFFIN: Perhaps we can change the phrase and say the employment of a Canadian tap dancer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is perhaps an extreme. Let us take a violinist; you do attach an importance to the fact that the violinist appearing on radio, let us say, is a Canadian?

MR. O'BRIEN: By that I would not say he had to be born in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not mean that.

MR. O'BRIEN: I think there is great value, for instance, in a programme presented on TV here in recent months which showed Frances Chapman playing a violin with the Halifax Symphony Orchestra

the background. I am one who prefers Western
sic, but I was certainly fascinated by this high
ass music supplied by a violinist who is local
d who, having the support of CBC by the income which
derived from playing on the CBC, is also available,
we said earlier, for visiting schools and playing
ere. I think that is of real value for Canadians.

THE CHAIRMAN: You see, this whole course
questioning is trying to draw a distinction between
o things that do get mixed up; one is the employ-
nt of Canadian talent, which may have this by-product
which you are speaking; the other is a production
distinctively Canadian programmes, things having
do with Canadian history, things having to do
th Canadian scenery and geography; things having
do with Canadian politics -- these are Canadian
rogrammes in the sense of programme content, and
I really wanted to know which it was you wanted,
ifty per cent to be merely fifty per cent made
n Canada, so to speak, or whether you want to have
ome percentage devoted to Canadian problems or
anadian expressions?

MR. O'BRIEN: I believe that when this
portion of the brief was drafted we had in mind
ifty per cent or more being Canadian in origin,
ut that a percentage of that again should be
ealing with Canadian problems. You leave out
rama in your list, and I saw on television last
ight a very fine drama produced for General Motors

o the CBC which involved problems of adolescence,
ciding whether they were going to McGill or Varsity
o some of these problems which are very real to us,
ad I do not think that same drama set in the United
States would have had the same appeal to Canadians.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand,
w heard yesterday a statement to the effect that the
CC were wasting a lot of money on second-class talent
order to get Canadian talent on their shows; they
lked of mediocrity and everything else.

MR. O'BRIEN: I do think there is a great
dal of second-class talent on programmes produced
oth in the United States and Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is where our
ogramme analysis can be of some help to us.

MR. COYNE: Then, in your next paragraph
u commend the CBC's policy of decentralized pro-
gamme production and the establishment of regional
oduction centres. We have heard a lot in the
st day or so about the inevitability, and, in
ct, the desirability of the centralization of
lent and production facilities in large centres
ich should result in the very best quality of pro-
ction being available; do you fear that this de-
ntralization may reduce the standards of programmes
d may have disadvantages as well as advantages?

MR. O'BRIEN: Surely it is not a ques-
on of either/or. We feel there are sufficient ad-
ntages in decentralization to warrant setting up

production centres in certain parts of the country, but even if you have these production centres on a regional basis, a great deal of the talent will drift to Toronto or Montreal where there is a higher demand and perhaps greater recognition, and people's careers are furthered, but in our view if all of the production were to be done in these centres we would miss a lot of the programmes which we hope would be Canadian in origin because they would be Ontario and Quebec in origin.

MR. COYNE: You really contemplate a balance between the two?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

DR. GIFFIN: I would think to begin with probably the regional productions might be of a lower standard than those centralized, but I think the eventual effect would be that such talent as developed would drift to the centres and then the quality at the centres would grow.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean you would get some up-grading of quality both at the region and at the centre?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is correct, because personally I would think there would be a very small group the centres must be drawing from.

MR. COYNE: And also you would suggest that the regional centres would act as training grounds for talent that would go to improve the field at the centralized points?

MR. O'BRIEN: That would happen.

MR. COYNE: Then, in the next paragraph you recommend that the CBC be enabled financially to institute an information centre dealing with employment opportunities in broadcasting. Could you explain a little on what you have in mind there?

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, this in the total picture of the brief is rather a minor point, but it has been suggested here that young people coming out of high school and college should be fully aware of the career possibilities that there are in a new and developing Canadian industry, and if these young people are fully aware of the career possibilities then the CBC or the private stations will have a wide field to choose from in selecting personnel in this field in the years to come, and surely the quality of programmes depends on having the very best of personnel that exists in this land.

DR. GIFFIN: This information could be made available to the directors of vocational guidance, possibly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was wondering if it really is not a matter for government at all; it is a matter for employment services and the Department of Labour rather than for CBC attempting to get itself into employment and vocational advice business.

MR. O'BRIEN: It would not be advice so much as information being available at the places where it could be considered.

E
Mel
6/20

THE CHAIRMAN: As you say, it is a rela-
vely minor point in your overall brief?

MR. O'BRIEN: Right.

MR. COYNE: Well then, turning to the
xt section of your brief dealing with programmes for
ildren and youth, and at the top of page 6 you say:

> "As an essential safe-
> guard for our children, the Nova Scotia
> Federation of Home and School Associa-
> tions would like to see an extension
> of research leading to more effective
> and broader use of television among
> all children and young people."

nd then you expand upon this idea that the research
ould be valuable, and I would like to ask you, some-
nat similar to the last question, whether the con-
inuing of research in this and in many other fields
here people feel they have legitimate interests in
roadcasting media, whether that is properly an
bligation of the CBC which should surely concern it-
elf primarily with the production and broadcasting
f programmes. Are you not asking the CBC to
xtend its operations with its limited resources
nto fields which could be equally well dealt with
y associations such as your own, provincial educa-
ional authorities and others?

MR. O'BRIEN: The CBC will have to have
some knowledge of what constitutes good programming
for children if it is to do a reasonable job at all.

think you have a point in terms of where the support or financing for the research should come from, but since the CBC is involved primarily, it is the primary organization in the field of television, which I feel should have co-ordination at least of the research and have research available to it. It is not directed primarily at what is good mental health for the children, but how do you put across ideas which contribute to good mental health through the medium of television? That is a problem which seems to me jointly that of the CBC and some other organizations, possibly our own nationally, possibly the Canadian Mental Health Association, and so on. Perhaps the financing of this research would come from a variety of sources but it is going to have to be headed up by some national organization, since the CBC is in the field nationally, and it would be a waste of money to duplicate this kind of research in every province where the educational departments are located.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the thing that lies behind this line of questioning and it is perfectly natural that it should be done this way, but we do have to raise a question about it, is the tendency to sort of look to CBC because it is a public body and participates in practically the whole life of Canada, being in the field of research I personally believe that the research should be done is almost beyond any argument; of course it should be done. However, the CBC are great users of

ectronic equipment and it is to their undoubted
terest that their electronic equipment should be
tter. I think it is debatable as to whether they
ould devote public funds towards electronic re-
arch. Now, what is the difference between that
d research in the programme content? Certainly
is in their interest to have good programmes.

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, there are companies
the field producing electronic equipment who can
e a profit at the end of the line for producing
tter electronic equipment, and it is in their inter-
t to carry out research in that field, and that
search undoubtedly benefits the CBC. In the field
children's programming there is not so readily
ailable the organization with funds ready to do
e research which is required for producing good
ildren's programmes. This is a new industry and
search, as you say, will have to be done by someone
mewhere. It is certainly related to television
nd we are making the point that we feel the CBC
ust certainly be involved in the research in
rder to be producing good quality programmes in
his field, and whether or not the CBC supplies
ll the funds or does it alone, we certainly feel
hat the CBC should be involved in it. It is not
he kind of thing that there is a profit at the end
f the line, and, therefore, most of the work will
ave to be done by research people who are financed
y public bodies or charitable organizations, one or
he other.

Hal
C/2

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There are agencies
n that field now in research and in these questions
f mental health. The Departments of Education are
radually getting interested in not only an education
ut as part of education, entertainment, for these
maller children. Do you think we should duplicate --
he CBC should duplicate these others or should they
raw on these various agencies?

MR. O'BRIEN: They not only should draw
n them but they need to draw each specifically into
he obligation in the television field. You see,
his research that may be going on in some of these
ields now has not been directed primarily towards
he application in the television field, and that is
here the CBC comes in.

MR. COYNE: Admittedly anybody doing
esearch in these fields would want to have the co-
peration of the CBC and the CBC would want to co-
perate?

MR. O'BRIEN: Right.

MR. COYNE: But surely you do not sug-
gest it is part of the CBC's function, out of what
will always be limited funds, limited for the pur-
pose of broadcasting, to develop itself into a
gigantic -- and it would be gigantic if all the
suggestions we have had from different bodies were
adopted -- research organization itself guaranteeing
the research, devoting its own staff and its own
funds to things other than broadcasting. Is this

t primarily a problem of education?

DR. GIFFIN: Well, our point here, I think, is that someone should do this.

MR. COYNE: But why pick out the CBC? I am just asking for development of ideas.

DR. GIFFIN: I will meet that point in a moment, why we bring it to the CBC. The Board of Governors is controlling one of the most potent methods of communication. Your Chairman asked a few minutes ago whether the CBC is to be concerned with all aspects of life in Canada, and with this means of communication he certainly -- you have the power of entering our homes and you have the power in your programming of influencing the minds and emotions of our children, so, therefore, we think the CBC must have a department concerned with research, whether that department does it themselves or whether it takes steps to see that some other agency carries it out.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can see that there would be a good deal of need for some department that would in a sense act in the applied end of research. In other words, once the fundamental research has been done, it would be translated into application in broadcasting so as to make use of the information that is available, but I think these questions are directed towards the recommendation here, which is, I think, to the effect, if I can put my finger on the words -- but the CBC

B
Hal
1/20

ıould do the fundamental research, should head it
), and I think your earlier answer to me was perh-
aps illustrative of the general attitude of many
eople who say that because there is a profit motive
n this kind of research,because it is not being done
y private industry as the electronics research will
e done, it is an obvious need through the CBC to do
t. If this is really a need is it not a case for an
rganization such as your own, either directly or
ndirectly, to develop the research that is required,
ith the obvious attitude in CBC that they make use
f it?

MR. O'BRIEN: I think it is in the interest
of both the CBC and the Home and School to see that
his research is done, and undoubtedly there should
e co-operation and further consideration as to how
t would be carried out and financed.

MR. COYNE: Well then, a little further
on in this same section, Mr. O'Brien, you say:

> "The Commission will understand that we take a serious view of the harm which may be done by undesirable programmes for children ..."

Are you thinking there of programmes that are
specifically children's programmes rather than pro-
gramming generally which children may by accident or
design happen to see, although the programme was
not intended for them?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I think we are

S
Hal
6/20

ying to make the distinction between the various stening hours. It is generally assumed here that e hours from, say, four o'clock to six o'clock are ildren's viewing hours; there are not too many ults in watching at that time, and there are quite few programmes which are obviously children's rogrammes in that period. We state in another lace that we feel it is up to the parents to egulate viewing by their children of adult pro- rammes, which would be evening programmes after the edtime of the children, so we are referring here to rogrammes which are put on in the hours that are enerally designed for children's viewing, and if a hild should happen to be watching a programme in the ate hours when he should be in bed, then it is his wn risk.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Are there any particular programmes that you would object to that are on the air now at hours for children's listening?

MR. O'BRIEN: We discussed this problem and decided not to make specific recommendations with respect to specific programmes. That is one reason we feel there is a need for research because it may be my opinion that Lassie is bad for my children and it may be Dr. Giffin's opinion that Lassie is good for his children, but someone who has more training certainly than I should look into it and make some decision.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, there was

E
Hal
6/20

unanimity of opinion in the Association as to
y specific programme?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: But let us say you had
ur research organization that would reach some kind
decision that Lassie was good or bad -- let us
y they decided it is bad -- well, then, are you not
tting dangerously close to censorship?

MR. O'BRIEN: I think the suggestion of
ur brief here is that certain hours of the day be
isted for children's programmes and that we would
ike to see in those hours programmes which would be
onsidered to be good programmes for children resulting
rom the research. Children are still up between
even and eight o'clock, and there may be programmes
n the doubtful category that are put in that period
hat some adults may want to watch and some children
ay want to watch. At least if we had that situa-
ion parents who felt it was important to have some
ontrol over what their children are watching, would
ay: "Well, you can watch anything you like between
our o'clock and six o'clock", and if they really
elt Lassie was bad and it was on at seven o'clock
hen the TV is off at that time. That would avoid,
t seems to me, outright censorship by some body
connected with the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Then, the next point I
wanted to raise was on page 7 where you are dealing
with school broadcasts, and you say:

"The objective should be to develop an effective television school programme, comparable in purpose and coverage to that of the national school radio broadcasts."

ow, in view of the costs, the very much larger costs f television, and the limited resources of a broad-asting organization, do you think the CBC should ndeavour to develop full-scale television school rogrammes or rather use its funds in concentrating n using its radio broadcasts?

MR. O'BRIEN: There are certainly advan-ages which are available in television for education hat are not available on radio. People can learn ore readily when they can see and hear both than they o when they just hear. However, this objective hich we have listed may be a fairly long-range bjective, but there is a major problem in this ountry because of the lack of teachers, and so on. ou will probably object again to this, that it is ot a function of the CBC but the function of the BC is to serve the people of Canada, and it seems o me that if it can supplement the sort of meagre eaching resources that we have available now, I feel it is a pretty effective way and I think we ought to be working on it and working towards this objective of making this effective and as complete as the national school radio broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne put to you the

Fal
6/9

st element in the production of the television ogrammes. I would like to put a slightly fferent cost element. Do you think the Home d School associations are prepared to buy tele- sion sets for the schools for the same kind of verage there is in connection with radio?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not feel primarily that he Home and School job has much to do with money aising.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not in fact assist n most cases in buying the radios?

MR. O'BRIEN: That would be done on a ocal association basis, and each local association s free to raise money and spend it the way it sees it. In some cities we might go to each school oard, and say, "We feel there should be radios in he classrooms or television sets". In some cities he schools are able to secure television sets solely n a promotion gimmick of one of the big department tores or super markets, which is being done right n this city today.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was really only raising it, not necessarily having to do with the Home and School associations, but the general costs.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, because it came up in the Prairie Provinces where they could not even afford to buy radios, so with the extra cost of television it seems almost a hopeless proposition.

MR. O'BRIEN: Well, there is a problem

at will have to be faced by the Department of ucation, by the school boards, by municipal uncils, about how they are going to carry on edu- tion in view of the increased costs of education, matter whether it is teachers' salaries or school ildings, and they, it seems to me, will have to ke into consideration television as well. It may that it is as cheap in the long run to supply a levision set as it is to supply a monitor in a hool where there is no qualified teacher.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the real question are asking is, there is no use producing television ogrammes unless there will be in fact pretty wide verage of these television school broadcasts?

MR. O'BRIEN: Does the Commission not ticipate that with time the costs of receiving sets black and white will be reduced and the high cost television as it stands today will not always be e same? This is a long-range objective.

THE CHAIRMAN: All the evidence that we ve had so far seems to indicate that the costs, least, of producing television programmes and oducing a television service for Canada are kely to rise rather than fall. There may be conomies in mass production of sets or technical evelopments; we really have not heard anything on at.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Forgive my ig- orance, but what are these national school radio

oadcasts? I do not know anything of them. Would u just in a few words tell me what they are, where ey come from?

MR. O'BRIEN: I am not as familiar with em as I might be. They certainly were not part of e school curriculum when I went to school. I take endorsement of these from other members of the mmittee who worked on this brief. I have heard about em at our conventions and so on, and perhaps Dr. ffin can say more about them.

DR. GIFFIN: With your permission, may refer that question to Mrs. Duckworth, who is in e audience and was a member of this committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, very well.

MRS. DUCKWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I would uggest it would be answered by the chairman of the ational Home and School Committee, who is going to resent a brief immediately following this one, and think probably it is part of his representation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting this afternoon?

MRS. DUCKWORTH: Yes, of the National Home and School.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hall and Mr. Simpson?

MRS. DUCKWORTH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will ask them later.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The reason for my question is, national implies it is not provincial, it comes from outside, and I think education

B
Hal
6/20

provincial prerogative, is it not?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: How do national programmes come from outside and how can they be distributed in Nova Scotia over and above the provincial prerogatives?

MR. O'BRIEN: I think Dr. Moffatt will have that, the Deputy Minister of Education in Nova Scotia, and he is here now.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may well be, since we use the word "national", we have had some evidence of this out west, and I took from that evidence that these programmes were worked out at least on a regional and perhaps on a provincial basis?

MR. O'BRIEN: I think regionally in this area.

MR. COYNE: Just one or two questions. Going on to your section on advertising policy, on page 8 you say:

> "While admitting the need for advertising revenues, we believe that detailed regulations governing it must be promulgated and enforced. These regulations must ensure that advertising is not offensive, inaccurate, too lengthy, or too frequent."

Would you not agree that there is a limit to what regulations can do? In other words, must not the regulations be such that the advertising revenues

e still available, that is, that advertisers are
ill prepared to advertise despite the regulations?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I think there is a point
ere, but if the regulations apply equally to CBC
d to private stations across the country, surely the
vertisers will face the same situation when they
nt to use this medium no matter to whom they go.
ere is a limit, but I think we can keep down the
ount of advertising and keep some control of it
d still get the advertising time. Time and
gotiations with advertisers would probably determine
ere that limit is.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, there are other
dia to advertise?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is right. Competition
om newspapers and magazines is one of the things
ich would help determine that limit. I think it
s pretty obvious that television advertising can
e pretty effective.

MR. COYNE: One final question arising
ut of your remarks on page 9, near the bottom of
he page. Do you feel that there could be, in both
adio and television, any extensive use of repeat
erformances?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, we do.

MR. COYNE: Those are all the questions I
ave, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Just following up
r. Coyne's question on repeat performances, and so

he record will be clear on that point, we have been old that under certain circumstances repeat performances cannot be given except at great cost because either the musicians or the actors or participants in a show must be paid extra for each extra showing that is made of these kinescopes. Therefore, there is not a saving by repetition, as one might think. I think earlier in the brief you also mention the question of getting programmes from abroad, and I imagine you have also in mind that we may sell abroad and in that way assist in the financing, but, as it has been told to us, there is a considerable element of cost there and consequently a deterrent to the export of Canadian television shows. I thought I would just mention that to keep the record clear.

MR. O'BRIEN: It seems to me that would be a limited factor on the saving; there would still be some saving and it might be an important enough matter that there should be some association between the CBC and the Musicians' Union or the other unions that are involved with a view to getting more repeat programmes at a lower per unit repeat cost. Surely they stand to benefit by having their programmes repeated, even if they do not get the full charge paid to them that they had originally. There is room, it seems to me, for some further consideration of that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: We raised this when the

B
Hal
6/20

ad of the Musicians' Union was before us in Toronto
d I think probably his argument as he gave it to
, or indicated it to us, was that rather than have
percentage of payment for the second half hour the
usicians would like to be employed for that second
lf hour at full rates. That is their point. I
ve just one question. On page 9 you mention
e various programmes which you commend highly, which
e generally speaking of an enlightenment or cultural
pe, having educational values rather than enter-
ainment mainly. You have through your various
odies a total membership of some twenty-two thousand
en and women. We have been searching and trying
o get evidence as to the degree to which these more
erious types of programmes are in fact listened to,
r, in fact, viewed. Again, going back to the
tatement that there is no use producing a programme
nless it is received or enjoyed, can you give us
ny indication from your membership as to the de-
ree to which there is a public utilization of
he more serious types of enlightenment types of
rogramme?

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not believe we could
ive any accurate indication. It seems to me that
ould require a pretty complete survey of our member-
hip to find out which programmes they prefer to
ee or hear.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You did not send
ut a questionnaire of any description?

E
Ral
6/20

MR. O'BRIEN: We sent out a very limited questionnaire to three regions in the province, but we did not feel that the answers which came were such that we could consider them the representation of the whole province. In fact, they did not bear directly on this problem which we are discussing now; it referred more specifically to children's programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I am referring generally to the enlightenment programmes, the CBC's Wednesday night, Citizens' Forum, serious music and talks?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, but our reason for doing this, we feel that they should be mentioned because we believe that minorities have the right to hear and see these various kinds of programmes even if the minorities may be fairly small. We do not have the statistics which would show the choices of these minorities but we feel that without the CBC we would not have as many of these programmes, and, therefore, it comes to this realm of finance, where we feel we must have a public agency which has funds to continue producing programmes of this kind which are available for the minorities who want to see them or hear them. I think we are all members of minorities of some kind. As a member of the church we might want to see or hear some religious programmes; as a minority that likes concert music, we may want to watch that sort of thing, but we do not feel that just because, if it were true that seventy-five per cent of the people prefer Rock and

E
Hal
6/20

oll to any other kind of music, we do not feel that ecessarily means that seventy-five per cent of the ime on the air should be devoted to that kind of usic.

THE CHAIRMAN: But from your general con- acts with your various groups, local associations, and he twenty-two thousand people, this willingness to isten to a thing like CBC Wednesday Night is not onfined to members of your committee; you think it uns very generally through your organization?

MR. O'BRIEN: I would say so. There are ther programmes I would put in the talks programmes, he farm programmes, which are very important to the arm people who make up a large proportion of our embership.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you think the farm roadcasts are listened to and utilized by the people?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not a question of bsolute judgment -- it is very important to get at he conflict of evidence that we have had. Some people ay these high brow, long hair programmes, nobody istens to them, and others say they are very valuable.

MR. O'BRIEN: I would think a smaller group would listen to CBC Wednesday Night than to arm broadcasts, but each has its place representing different minorities. I think a lot of us in the cities listen to the farm broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much.

Hal
6,20

u obviously know that we were interested in your
ief by the number of questions we had. I think
did ask Mr. Simpson and Mr. Hall to be available
go on this morning, but it is so near to the time
adjournment that I think, if it is convenient
you gentlemen, we will adjourn until two-thirty
d call the Canadian Home and School and Parent-
acher Federation, to be followed by the National
lvisory Council on School Broadcasting. Those
e the last two briefs here, and we will then
nclude our Halifax hearings.

We will adjourn now until two-thirty.

--Whereupon the hearings adjourned until 2.30 P.M.

AA
Hal
6/20

--Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.

- - - - - -

SUBMISSION OF
CANADIAN HOME AND SCHOOL
PARENT-TEACHER FEDERATION

Appearances:

Mr. Harold Simpson, Executive Vice-President

Mr. Willis M. Hall, National Chairman

- - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall come to order. The first brief is that of the Canadian Home and School Parent-Teacher Federation, and I understand Mr. Harold Simpson, the Executive Vice-President, will present the brief and Mr. Willis M. Hall is the National Chairman.

We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 141.

EXHIBIT NO. 141: Brief of Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether you gentlemen were here this morning when we opened, but you have seen our procedure. We start with the presentation of the brief, either by reading or outlining it, as you see fit, and then we will have questions merely to expand and bring out the

erall brief. Will you proceed, please?

MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, is it in order read the brief?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, indeed.

MR. SIMPSON: May I just say at the outset at Mr. Hall, the Chairman of the Committee who pre-red this brief, worked in consultation with our rious federations across the country. We have nine ovincial federations and it does represent the jority thinking of these provincial federations. is is just as a matter of clarification.

"The Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation, representing 274,693 members organized in 3,672 local associations in nine provincial federations across Canada (Newfoundland is not presently organized as a Provincial Federation) is pleased to submit this statement of our views with respect to broadcasting in Canada under the terms of Order in Council P.C. 1955-1796, of December 2nd, 1955. Our organization, which is national in scope, has as its objects, eight points:

1. To promote the welfare of children and youth.
2. To raise the standards of home life.
3. To promote and secure adequate legislation for the care and protection of children and youth.
4. To foster co-operation between parents and teachers in the training and guidance of children and youth, both during and after the school period.

AA
PA
6/20

5. To obtain the best for each child according to his physical, mental, social and spiritual needs.

6. To give parents an understanding of the school and its work, and to assist in interpreting the school in all its aspects to the public.

7. To confer and co-operate with organizations other than school which concern themselves with the care, protection and training of children and youth in the home, school and community; and with the education of adults to meet these responsibilities.

8. To foster high ideals of citizenship and patriotism; and to promote, through educational means, international good-will and peace.

"Our Federation has representation on the National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting. In this connection our organization has a very definite interest in broadcasting in Canada."

have had two very important experiments and are present interested in classroom education. The cond experiment in classroom television, a copy of e questionnaire to be used in that survey, is appended r your information.

"Such nationally known programmes as Cuckoo Clock House, the Mental Health Series, the Way of the Parent and Kindergarten of the

Air, have been endorsed by The Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation. Last year our organization conducted a survey of home listening to the National School Radio Broadcasts. A copy of this survey is appended.

"The views and convictions of the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation with respect to the various items listed in the terms reference of Order in Council P.C. 1955-1796 of December 2nd, 1955, are set forth as follows:

Under (a) the policies to be followed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in its television broadcasting activities and the relation of such policies to the finances of the Corporation;

We wish to endorse in a general way, the present policy and regulation governing the control and operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, namely -

(i) The control of all broadcasting vested in a single national authority.

(ii) Public ownership of all high powered stations and co-ordination of the privately owned low powered stations.

(iii) Co-ordination of all broadcasting in Canada including all programmes and all wire-line networks.

(iv) Constitution as a public corporation with

AA
Hel
6/20

policy formulated by the Board of Governors and administered by a General Manager and an Assistant Manager responsible to the Board of Governors.

(v) Continued careful selection of the members of the Board of Governors.

(vi) A body independent of partisan politics, yet accountable to parliament.

vii) The sole authority for the establishment of a National Short Wave Station.

iii) An equitable time allotment to political parties in the presentation of their platform and policies to the electorate.

(ix) The use of the National System as an instrument of education and entertainment. A means of mobilizing the National effort in times of crisis and distress.

We express our belief that these broad policies must be continued in the future to maintain broadcasting in Canada in the national interest. It is our opinion that policy (iii) --"co-ordination of all broadcasting in Canada including all programmes and all wire-line networks"-- is difficult to administer in practice. We suggest that a separate committee of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be set up to administer its regulations and to ensure that the private radio stations do, in practice, follow the regulations as set forth in the

AA
Rel
6/20

statutes, Chapter 32, R.S.C., 1952.

Under (b) the measures necessary to provide an adequate proportion of Canadian programmes for both public and private broadcasting.

We believe that the number of programmes produced in Canada, using Canadian artists and Canadian talent, should be increased. Such a policy would encourage Canadians to develop their talent and would give our National Television Network a truly Canadian character. Since broadcasting in Canada is opening up continuous opportunities for employment, and since many of the persons so employed, both as artists and technicians, must come from among the students presently enrolled in our schools and universities, we urge the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Federal Government to prepare informative material describing opportunities for employment in these fields. Such prepared material, whether on film or in printed form, should be available for distribution to schools and universities throughout the provinces of Canada. We believe that there should be the fullest possible utilization of local talent available in each of the five major programme production areas of Canada. In this respect we submit that Canadian universities are able to make a fine contribution in the Arts and Sciences and that their assistance should be sought to

a greater extent than is presently the case. We believe that there should be a larger proportion of programmes originating in Great Britain, France, and other European and Commonwealth countries. It is reasonable to expect that one quarter of the programmes viewed should originate in the United States.

Under (c) the financial requirements of the Corporation for television broadcasting and the relation of these to the extent, nature and standards and distribution of programmes.

We believe that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation needs a guaranteed income which will provide for necessary expansion of facilities and which will allow for the best type of programming. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be in a position to make contracts for future programmes with the assurance that it will have adequate money available in the future to pay for them when they are produced. We would urge caution in the development of colour television. We feel that its introduction into Canada should be withheld until such time as we are adequately served by 'black and white' and until such time as the cost will bring it within the reach of those within the average income bracket. At the present we feel that the money needed to develop colour television could be

more effectively spent on the improvement of programmes. We believe that there is room for improvement in the type and standards of programmes currently being produced. In this connection we would stress the following points:

(1) We believe that more attention should be given to the type of programme being offered during the hours when children are viewing. We would emphatically ask for the curtailment of all programmes depicting crime in any form. (See note (2) Appendix.)

(2) We call for the regulation of advertising during all programmes, but particularly during children's programmes. We would suggest more sponsored programmes and less direct advertising. Certain programmes most highly regarded by our organization, such as Citizens' Forum, do not lend themselves to commercial sponsorship, hence need financing from public funds. We would stress the need for more programmes of this type. We submit that the time and frequency of advertising on all programmes must be more carefully regulated.

(3) We believe that there is an urgent need for improvement in the means of disseminating information with respect to the programmes being offered on television and radio. We suggest that the Canadian

AA
Hal
6/20

Broadcasting Corporation might do more to publicize its CBC Times.

Under (d) the financial requirements of the Corporation for sound broadcasting in the light of the development of television and the growth of population in new areas of Canada.

We recognize the high cost of TV production in a country with such vast geographic distances and where two language networks must operate in parallel. We congratulate the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the tremendous achievements which they have made in so short a time under difficult conditions. We recognize that it is possible to use programmes that originate in the United States and whose costs have been largely met by the mass of the viewing public of that country, but we do not feel that this should prevent the development of our own programmes for a distinctly Canadian network. We submit that if the money needed is not available from present sources, that is, 15 per cent excise tax on tubes and receiving sets, and revenue from sponsored programmes and advertising, it will have to be provided by Parliament and paid for by the public who view and listen.

Under (f) the licensing and control of private television and sound broadcasting

AA
Hal
6/20

stations in the public interest.

The control and licensing of private television and sound broadcasting stations should remain with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Such control ensures that there will be no channel interference, that the high power stations will be owned nationally and that programmes and advertising will be regulated. The establishment of private TV stations should be conditional upon the type of programme to be offered and the financial resources available to ensure efficient and high quality operation in the public interest. We cannot find any reason to exclude private TV from areas presently served by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation providing the conditions just mentioned can be guaranteed.

Under (g) Such other related matters as the Commissioners consider should be included in reporting properly upon those specified.

We urge a continuation of the experiments in classroom television with a view to developing them into a regular feature comparable to the present National School Radio Broadcasts.

"Finally we would urge that there be a continuation of those programmes that are cultural and educational, of those programmes that are morally, spiritually and mentally elevating, and those programmes which portray the best in Canadian life.

AA
Hal
6/20

"We trust that these submissions will be helpful to you in your deliberations. We feel that they are in keeping with the high objectives of our organization.

"On behalf of The Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation."

This, Mr. Chairman, is signed by Lilian . Evans, who was president at the time the brief was repared. We have had an annual meeting since then nd have a new president from Hamilton, Ontario. ay I just add this, that Mr. Hall, who has been closely n touch with the brief, is probably better able to nswer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you get to that, I onder if you could outline these appendices in the rief?

MR. SIMPSON: Perhaps Mr. Hall would do that.

MR. HALL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know the exact order in which to take this accumulation that I have before me here - "The Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher Federation Home Listening Survey." At the conclusion of the recent series of classroom television programmes, our Federation sent out this questionnaire to its membership across Canada. Now, we have selected a random sampling of one thousand persons, who guaranteed to watch some or all of the programmes, and these questionnaires are concluded and forwarded to us so we may have the opinion of parents as to the suitabilities of these programmes for our children in

AA
Hal
c/2c

e schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is for the television periment. Then there is another.

MR. HALL: The second one is the School dio Broadcast home listening survey. Our Federa- on last year made a survey to determine the reaction parents to the school radio broadcasts, and a copy that was appended for your information.

THE CHAIRMAN: How wide a selection of answe d you have? It may be here but I missed it.

MR. HALL: On page 2; of the 13,027 sent ut we received replies from 1,751. There was no pecific request that they had to be completed in the elevision survey; we only gave them out to those who e knew would take part. In other words, through hese experiments we hoped to gain information as to he parents' reaction to these programmes. You ill notice, too, that there are two articles refer- ed to, "How TV is Changing your Life", from aclean's Magazine, and Parents' Magazine and Family ome Guide, "Television and our Children". I ave copies of the magazines with me, if necessary, nd the quotations are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if you do not want o add anything more now we will proceed to the questions. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: I wonder, Mr. Hall, if you would turn to page 2, near the bottom of the page; under Term of Reference "A" you say:

AA
Hal
6/2

"We suggest that a separate committee of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should be set up to administer its regulations ..."

wonder if you could develop in a little more detail ne idea you had in mind there?

MR. HALL: Yes, sir. It is our feeling hat a separate committee, responsible to the Board of overnors of the CBC, ought to be set up for the sole urpose of administering and enforcing the regulations nder the Statute, and that the committee ought to e the committee to monitor radio and television cross Canada and see to it that all persons conerned are in fact following the statutes as precribed.

MR. COYNE: This would be a committee of r under the Board of Governors -- something separate?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, but having nothing to o with programming or technical operation at all, ust set up for that specific purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask, do you think of t as a committee of members of the Board of Governors or as a committee of the officials of the Corporation or as a special branch of the Corporation with maybe new employees in there to handle it?

MR. HALL: The latter was our intent, something in the nature of inspectors.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you think of it as being an operating part of the official organization rather

an an administration branch of the Board of Gover-
rs? In other words, you do not want the committee
be a subcommittee on regulation and enforcement to
e Board of Governors? That is not your idea?

MR. SIMPSON: No.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us what your
asons are for believing this would be a desirable
ing?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, it is our feeling that
e CBC is looked upon, in regard to its relationship
th the network and the private stations, as sort of
co-operative partnership, and it is the feeling of
r Federation that they do not want to step on
ybody's toes in order to maintain the goodwill
at they now must enjoy, and if a separate regula-
ry body were set up then that normal relationship
programming and so forth could be maintained
thout any difficulty.

MR. COYNE: But you, of course, do not
pport the idea of the independent regulatory body
the sense in which it has been presented to us
y other interests as being a body separate from the
BC and overseeing both the CBC and the private
tations?

MR. SIMPSON: That is correct; we would
ot support that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you feel there
s laxity at the moment in supervision and their
nsistence on stations obeying these regulations?

MR. HALL: In the course of the preparation of our brief, several points of view that would substantiate that opinion were submitted to us.

MR. SIMPSON: There is always the factor that there has been a good deal of criticism of the CBC which is an active programming organization also being the final arbitrator, and we feel this would do away with that.

MR. COYNE: Well then, turning to the next heading at the top of page 3, you say:

> "We believe that the number of programmes produced in Canada, using Canadian artists and Canadian talent, should be increased."

and I would just like to ask you whether that is an unqualified suggestion in the sense in which it is made there or whether it should be qualified in terms of the cost of these programmes and also the quality and the talent that is available?

MR. HALL: We would agree with the latter that this is a long-range programme at the moment. We are at the beginning of our stage of development of Canadian talent, and until such time as we have developed it we cannot expect that Canadian programmes will be put on the air. We do ask as a long-term programme that increased effort be made to use Canadian talent, and we would recognize too that this can only be done as the funds are available.

(Page 3528 follows)

MR. COYNE: An effort to use Canadian lent without reducing the standard of the programming/

MR. HALL: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Throughout you are scussing the CBC. That has no reference to private ations?

MR. HALL: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on this point, you may ve been here this morning when we were discussing a mewhat similar point: this is looking to the employ- nt of Canadian talent rather than being particularly rected to the development of programmes having a rticular Canadian content?

MR. HALL: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is Canadian talent you re on now?

MR. HALL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you given any thought o that other question of the use of radio and tele- ision as a means of interpreting Canada to Canadians, f you want a phrase for it?

MR. HALL: Yes, and it is the thought of ur Federation that we should do that as much as ossible.

MR. SIMPSON: The whole is interlinked in ur opinion, Mr. Chairman. You can't separate them.

MR. COYNE: A little further down in the ame paragraph you urge the Canadian Broadcasting orporation and the Federal Government to prepare

nformative material describing opportunities for
mployment in these fields -- that is, in radio and
elevision:

"Such prepared material, whether on film or in printed form, should be available for distribution to schools and universities throughout the provinces of Canada."

his is the same point that was again made by the Nova
cotia Federation this morning, and I realize it is
ot the major element in your brief, but I would like
o ask you the same sort of question as to whether
his essentially non-broadcasting function is the sort
f thing which the CBC should be required to take on
nd finance?

MR. HALL: My answer to that, sir, is this: o one else is in a position to know what the expansion expected by the CBC is going to be nor are we n a position to know what vacancies will be available n the CBC, what type of talent they are looking for. e depend on the CBC to give us that information, and hether or not the information is disseminated by the ivil Service, the Government or by the CBC directly, t must come in its origin from the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Would you say this sort of hing would work to the advantage of the CBC in the rogressive recruitment of talent or personnel?

MR. HALL: I would think it would, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I rather judge from

hat we heard yesterday that CBC does all right by
ust raiding the private stations and taking away
heir good men, so maybe we could leave that to the
rivate stations and save ourselves the taxes.

MR. SIMPSON: Mr. Chairman, our thinking
s that this whole field of broadcasting is a field
f opportunity, and in most fields of opportunity
oung people are being put in contact with what these
ields have to offer. We feel that in this field
oung people should be put in contact with what is
eing offered and what future there is for them,
nd you will note that we say, "The Canadian Broad-
asting Corporation and the Federal Government".
e did not feel we were competent to suggest the
echanics of how it should be done, but we feel it
s the responsibility of the two groups to work out
he detail of it and to do the job.

MR. COYNE: In the immediate following
ntence you say:

> "We believe that there should be the fullest possible utilization of local talent available in each of the five major programme production areas of Canada."

gain this is somewhat related to a question I asked
ou a moment or two ago: What do you mean by "the
ullest possible utilization"?

MR. HALL: Within the limits of practica-
ility.

MR. COYNE: Including the maintenance of programme standards?

MR. HALL: Yes, definitely, and the facilities available to produce the programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Along the same line as we were discussing this morning, I would gather from this that you would prefer the use of local talent even at some expense in programme quality rather than production of the highest level of quality going to wherever the best talent happened to be, if it happened to be concentrated?

MR. HALL: I think so, yes. It is the policy, for example, in our Federation to encourage music festivals across the country. We realize that the children who participate in these festivals are not professionals; they are very amateurish. We believe the very fact a child has an opportunity to get up and sing before the public is an encouragement, and that it will develop talent. In the same sense we would look upon television, and we do definitely feel there is a very great interest in the development of local talent.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had the two different points of view expressed: one is the notion that we are dealing in a medium, an artistic medium, and you either put on the best possible programme you can put on, irrespective of whether it all comes from one place or whether it comes in a scattered way from different places, and the other method -- and this is, I think, your suggestion -- is that

ou are prepared to give way a little on the pro-
ramme quality in order to get decentralization and
alance supplied across the country?

MR. HALL: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it you are supporting
he second rather than the first of those two
pproaches?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. SIMPSON: There are two factors there.
he is, you are not going to get your top talent unless
hese other people are brought into the picture at a
ower level anddeveloped. There will be a weeding
ut and some will go up to the top talent. The
econd is that there is probably a tendency on the
art of the listening public to be interested in
eople they know. A group of children put on a
oncert in the local community and the parents and
riends all go to see it because they know the
hildren. They don't do nearly as well as per-
aps some group they may watch on television, but
here is that personal interest. A survey has
een made in connection with the particular local
elevision station that we view in my part of the
rovince, and there is a local programme on bringing
n local personalities twice a week. It is by far
he most popular programme of the whole series,
ecause people know these people they see and hear
articipating, and I think there is perhaps some
alue there, that you are bringing in artists
aybe not comparable to the best in the country,

t artists who people know, and they are interested hearing them participate in different types of ogramme.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would only be on the ogrammes that would have just a local distribution?

MR. SIMPSON: I think regional.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you would not press your alogy with the school concert to the point that if I there and see my boy playing the piano ---

MR. SIMPSON: No, just of interest to those o are known to those listening. We in the Atlantic ovinces know our Atlantic participants in radio and , and we are perhaps more interested than we are someone who is more competent but whom we don't ow anything about. At the same time, we are not lvocating lowering standards.

MR. COYNE: Well then, in the next sentence ill in the same paragraph you submit that Canadian iversities are able to make a fine contribution the Arts and Sciences and that their assistance ould be sought to a greater extent than is presently e case: I was wondering whether you have anything rticular in mind as to the role which you say ould be played by universities in programming?

MR. HALL: Our thoughts concentrated here upon certain efforts which we know have been ade and certain productions that have been produced n our national universities which we feel ought to ain national recognition. For example, shall I

y this year at Acadia they produced "Le Maitre
and Pre", a light opera on the history of Grand Pre
Nova Scotia, which has received considerable acclaim.

MR. COYNE: Was that produced by the univer-
ty dramatic society, or Glee Club?

MR. HALL: Yes. In the fields of political
fairs, Dalhousie here has made notable contributions.
ople from the faculty of the university could quite
sily be used on the programming of CBC.

MR. COYNE: You haven't any particularly
ecific suggestions, but merely the expansion of the
rt played by universities and university personnel?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Under the next heading on the
llowing page, page 4, you say:

> "We believe that there is
> room for improvement in the type and
> standards of programmes . . ."

d in this connection you stress three points, and
e second one has to do with the regulation of
vertising, and I take it that you are not against
lvertising as such as a source of revenue for the
3C?

MR. HALL: No, we are not opposed to
dvertising as such provided it is regulated adver-
.sing.

MR. COYNE: Would you also agree -- and
think I asked this this morning also -- that it
ould be bad regulation if it was so extreme as to

scourage the advertisers from advertising?

MR. HALL: I would put myself on record saying -- and this is a personal point of view and ot a Federation point of view -- that if advertising re morally wrong I would say it ought to be curiled so that it does not exist -- eliminate it.

MR. COYNE: On the other hand it seems to pretty clear that as a practical matter the CBC going to be forced to depend, in order to extend s programming along the desirable lines that appear be wanted in this country, and is going to have to cept, particularly on television, a large amount of mmercial revenue?

MR. HALL: I think we can look at it this y, that a person or a corporation or a company who vertises expects to sell products, and that, I think, their legitimate right, otherwise they could use me other medium for advertising, but I think the lvertising should be of such a nature that it does t do as was intimated in the Federation brief from va Scotia -- the sort of thing that causes children coax for a particular brand or product.

MR. COYNE: I see. You are really directng your caution towards the elimination of the re extreme aspects of what you might call advertising abuse?

MR. SIMPSON: To the use of common sense the directing of advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: All these questions are ut to you to bring out the issue; don't let anyone

ead into them any opinions at all. What do you say
o the argument of the advertiser that you don't have
o regulate these things, that if they are unacceptable
o the public, by and large, the public won't buy the
oods, and therefore the whole exercise of putting a
rogramme on is wasted, and that the public is not
oing to stand for unending repetition of commercials;
t will switch the dial off, which it can always do,
nd the moment you do that, and he becomes irritated
t the advertiser, that reflects itself in the very
hing he is after -- the sale of goods. Let us
ake this business of telling children they ought
o buy a certain breakfast food: well, why not? What
s the basic reason for not having that on the air?

MR. HALL: This is the answer that I have
o the problem -- simply this: I can think of one
rogramme that is on television now that is one of
he leading programmes, and probably has one of the
argest viewing audiences, anyway. Without naming
t, as it is not our policy to do so, I have seen
ime and again when the programme was reaching its
ost interesting point the screen would be changed
nd the commercial flash introduced in the middle
f the programme. It is not only distracting but
t is using advertising to excess. It is dis-
urbing the programme itself. The programme
loses its continuity and its interest because
the advertising is so interspersed with the pro-
gramme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the answer that the
vertiser gave us when we put this kind of question
reference to that was, this advertising is the price
at you are paying for getting an expensive programme
ee; the public generally has no God-given right to
tertainment on the air; they are getting entertained,
d since they are getting entertainment they don't
y the price necessarily in the higher price for the
ods -- it may or may not do that -- so the advertiser
ys, but you pay the price in listening to the adver-
sing, and if at any given moment you don't like the
terruption to your programme, they would say, you
n't have to listen to it. And if you had enough
ople turn it off, they won't interrupt the programme.

MR. HALL: I think there are two points in
nnection with it: simply this; take here in Halifax,
r example, you either listen to the programme or
don't view at all. There is only one station
ich we can get with ease and we must either follow
at programme or do without. If we had some choice
might change to another programme, and I can say
is too, that our Federation at its national con-
ntion this year passed a resolution of commen-
ation to the Disney Studios in Hollywood for the
pe of programme produced in Disneyland with which
feel the Federation was pleased, and we are
ending a copy of our resolution to the CBC. We
re pleased with the programme not only because it
s directed to the children and is well prepared,

t we are pleased with it because the advertising
iat goes along with it precedes the programme and
omes after the programme. It is not stressed. It
s a sort of sponsored programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: I really want -- it is towards
ie question of how you achieve the result which most
eople would probably be inclined to agree with you,
amely, that you don't want too many interruptions and
o much offensiveness by interruption or any other
ay. You are apparently suggesting this should be
one by way of regulation. I am just asking you
' the members of your organization, the 274,693 of
hem, were to make their opinions felt when a dra-
atic programme is being interrupted by advertising,
f you don't like it, don't you think you could
ffect a change without regulation?

MR. HALL: We have across Canada, in our
ther provincial federations, viewing groups who
atch very carefully all the programmes on television,
nd our reports are being circulated through our pro-
incial federations. Whether or not the advertisers
now it, we choose and select the ones that we like.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only raising the ques-
ion as to whether, to achieve the result you want,
he best method is the regulation you are suggesting,
r whether you can get that without the intervention
f law and State control?

MR. SIMPSON: May we put it this way:
hat regulation is not the best way, but it may for a

ime be the only way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I will come back at the uestion to you: is it even now the only way? I am ot saying it is not.

MR. SIMPSON: My personal opinion is that the esirable thing is to present to the advertisers the ublic reaction, and if the public reaction is not avourable to as many interruptions, the advertisers' ood common sense would mean they would not -- the hing is, how can you get that public opinion and ass it on to the advertiser? That is one of the roblems in doing it by the more desirable way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the post office still sells tamps.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are dealing with a ery costly operation here in television or radio, nd somebody has to pay the price for it. You can ay the price through taxes or by licensing, or y suffering for a minute or two every half hour to isten to somebody selling soap. Now, which is the ess disagreeable -- the paying out of your pocket of he taxes, or the joy or misery of listening for a ew minutes to somebody advertising?

MR. SIMPSON: We are not saying the adver- ising should not be in the picture at all. That is ot the idea. However, with children's programmes -- nd we are interested in children, as an organiza- ion -- it may be necessary to have some form of regulation for advertising in order to overcome a

situation that, in our opinion, is undesirable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the only point of my question, and the point put by the advertisers which I was putting to you, is that they are not in this business to put out a lot of money for fun. If they are putting on a programme which is not getting popular support and is not accomplishing their objectives, they would be the first people who would want to change it.

MR. HALL: We can look at it another way too: we have heard something in our press lately about the question of billboard advertising; it is accepted in most places across Canada, but people are beginning to question whether or not some regulation with respect to it ought not to be brought in, and I think we are coming to the opinion that probably some control over the regulation of billboard advertising is necessary. We would suggest there may be a parallel here. We do not oppose advertising as such. We want to ensure that the kind of advertising that is done does not detract from the programme itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on this same paragraph, why do you say that certain programmes which you regard highly, such as Citizens' Forum, do not lend themselves to commercial sponsorship? Why not?

MR. HALL: The type of programme that

nds itself to commercial sponsorship is the kind
programme that is intended to be entertaining and
ich will command the largest viewing audience.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think it is the
ewing audience you have to think of when you think
the advertiser.

MR. HALL: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: It isn't because you think
ere is something inherent in the programme itself
at makes it impossible to be sponsored?

MR. SIMPSON: It is not attractive to the
ivertiser because of a small viewing audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would have no objec-
ion to Citizens' Forum being sponsored if some
ivertiser wanted to sponsor it?

MR. HALL: No.

MR. COYNE: Going down to the last sen-
ence:

> "We submit that if the money needed is not available from present sources, that is, 15 per cent excise tax on tubes and receiving sets, and revenue from sponsored programmes and advertising, it will have to be provided by Parliament and paid for by the public who view and listen."

Are you suggesting a licence fee arrangement for the
provision of these funds?

MR. HALL: No, I am definitely not sug-
gesting that. However, during the course of the

reparation of our brief a point was made by cer-
ain sections of the membership that it is unfair
o tax people who do not have these facilities.

MR. COYNE: Have you any suggestions as
o some method of financing, other than out of
eneral tax revenue, which would have this result
hich you speak of?

MR. HALL: We were not sufficiently aware
f the taxation structure to pass a competent opinion
n that point, and for that reason we would hesitate
o make a specific suggestion as to how the money
hould be raised by Parliament, but we feel it must
ome from Parliament.

MR. COYNE: But you are positively against
he imposition of a licence fee, which is perhaps the
implest and most straightforward way of ensuring
hat the programmes are paid for by the public who
iew and listen; somebody who did not have a set
ould not have to pay for the programmes.

MR. HALL: There is a difference of
pinion on that point: some people have no objection
to a licence fee; others do. We were not able to
determine what the majority thought about it, and
therefore we would not express an opinion.

MR. COYNE: Just interpreting what you
have actually said here as representing the views
of the Association, you are not recommending a
licence fee?

MR. HALL: No, we are not.

MR. COYNE: You say it will have to be
:ovided by Parliament, but again you are not really
:king any specific recommendation as to it being
:ovided out of tax revenue, which again seems to
the only obvious alternative, or under any other
thod?

MR. HALL: We think the onus for the de-
sion is a political matter that ought to be de-
ded by Parliament.

MR. COYNE: But, as a matter of assistance
this Commission or to Parliament, you cannot think
fhand of any alternative to the licence fee which
uld ensure this was paid for by the public who
ew and listen, and not from the general public?

MR. HALL: That is correct. I do not
e any alternative, but at the same time I am not
epared to recommend ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You may be able to say this
for Parliament to decide, but, unfortunately, we
n't. We were asked to advise Parliament on how
is was to be done. I would like to go back to
ge 3 where you are talking about the development
colour television.

MR. HALL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You urge caution in the
evelopment of that and that it should be withheld
n Canada until such time as we are adequately
overed in black and white. It has been put to us,
think -- I have read it somewhere -- that this is

quite possible policy for a country like the United Kingdom or Australia, but whether or not it is a possible policy for Canada is a question, where we are, in fact, living in conditions where quite a substantial percentage of locations in Canada are reached by American television, that to some extent we are forced to move into the colour television field at something approaching the pace of the American developments in this field, at the risk of having our entire listening audience who can afford colour sets buying them and tuning in on the American stations. Have you considered that at all?

MR. HALL: Yes, we thought about it very carefully, as a matter of fact, and our opinions are these: that for a country which must expand and develop, and where we must have two networks, that colour television is a luxury which we at this moment cannot afford. We don't say that, as technological developments come along and colour television possibly is easier to produce and cheaper, the time may not come in Canada when it would not be a luxury, and at such time we would be prepared to support it, but for the moment we feel we can ill afford to go into it, and we would rather see the money spent -- that would be needed for the research and development of facilities -- on improvement of the present programming in black and white.

(Page 3545 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: The idea on the other side .s that, let us say, tomorrow, to make it similar, the .mericans were able to move holus-bolus over to colour; .t is not going to be done overnight, but that makes .t simpler, and the argument is the superior attrac- :ion of colour would immediately drain off something .ike -- I think in Canada nine hundred thousand out ›f the present two million sets can reach American .tations, and to the extent that those turn to the .merican colour it means that your television audience n Canada suddenly drops from two million sets to ne million one hundred thousand sets. That naturally minimizes the value of advertising and cuts down on he advertising revenue and you get yourself into a ituation where the money you are spending on your anadian black and white system is not actually roducing the result you want it to produce.

MR. HALL: Well, I think we must keep ppraised of the developments taking place in the nited States, and if it seemed at some time that ur whole national system would be scuttled because e did not have coloured television, we would have o seriously go into the matter. But, because he United States can afford to build an aircraft arrier as large as the Forestall, it does not ollow that our aircraft carrier need to be as arge and as powerful.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but I doubt if that s a fair analogy because here you are dealing with

imilar systems. We may have a more elaborate orm of railway coaches today because Americans have t; we perhaps could not prevent ourselves doing that.

MR. SIMPSON: In this we are not talking n terms of the long view, you notice we say at the resent time our feeling is that coloured television as to come. I think we have to realize that. It s in the probably not too far distant future but he thinking behind it is we need more black and hite coverage in the immediate future and I think hat is why these words "at the present" are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just raising what was ut to us on somewhat the other side of your presenta-ion. I have one other question on this part: why o you say that you believe newscasts and other con-roversial issues should not be sponsored? Why should newscasts not be sponsored? It is sponsored on many private radio stations today, it is sponsored on many American stations, I believe. What is the reason you say the newscasts, to take them alone, should not be sponsored?

MR. HALL: There is a healthy respect in the minds of the public for the kind of newscast that is not sponsored because there is an associa-tion in the minds of the public that the sponsor may or may not be biased with respect to the news being presented.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would you think an opinion like that is widely held?

MR. HALL: I think it is dangerous if it is held by anyone.

THE CHAIRMAN: We did inquire in a more local type of news broadcast by private stations which are sponsored certainly and the answer so far has been that not only does the sponsor not attempt to influence the newscasts, the content of them, but it is physically impossible for him to do so the way the private stations operate the news.

MR. HALL: There is another thought too, which was presented to us, that certain issues which involve government and politics could be construed as having the support of large organizations if those organizations were sponsoring newscasts with respect to them, and we feel that is a bad situation, that on controversial issues and on newscasts it ought to be presented without sponsorship so the people will get the impression they are getting straight facts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have no idea what is involved but supposing you make an income for the CBC of $2 million if they allowed their newscasts to be sponsored; is it worth $2 million to keep this vague fear out of the people's minds, in taxes?

MR. HALL: We do not feel that the CBC as a nationally owned corporation responsible to Parliament ought to need, as a national organization, a commercial sponsor to produce its newscasts.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The public have not the fear that the Government, since it is operating a Crown agency, would bias the news in their

f vour?

MR. HALL: I do not think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But an advertiser

.ght?

MR. HALL: I think so.

MR. SIMPSON: Particularly today, with

ontroversial matters. To use as an example, the

il discussion in the United States at the present

ime. If an oil company was sponsoring the news

hat had to do with a bill in Congress today having

o do with oil rights, I think there might be a

ublic fear that that news, perhaps, did not come in

he way it could be on an unsponsored programme.

here may be a certain amount of unconscious bias on

he part of the sponsor.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That would be

n the case of a private broadcaster; in the case

f the CBC do you think, quite apart from what

he public might think, do you think the CBC could

e swayed in the presentation of its news?

MR. SIMPSON: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, we have

sked questions on this self-same subject and we

ave been told by the CBC and by a number of private

tations that they will allow no interference from

nybody on any programme that they put on, whether

t is news, entertainment or talks.

MR. HALL: I think there is another

angle involved too, and I do not want to develop

at any length but there are certain things which r organization considers to be harmful for children d youth, and we would not wish to see these things come commercially sponsored, such as news and ntroversial subjects, in this country.

THE CHAIRMAN: I interrupted you, Mr. yne, as you were moving to page 4.

MR. COYNE: On page 5 you are going on to e question of licensing and control and you say in e first paragraph:

> "The establishment of private TV stations should be conditional upon the type of programme to be offered and the financial resources available to ensure efficient and high quality operation in the public interest."

take it you are speaking there of establishing dditional TV stations?

MR. HALL: That is correct, sir. Supposing we had a private station in the City of alifax running alongside of CBHT.

MR. COYNE: Well, do you envisage as a ondition of the licence that there should be some rovision affecting programme content, let us say, hat the licencee of the second station would have o comply with?

MR. HALL: Yes, similar to that now necessary for a licence for radio broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on that question, do you think you can specify sufficiently as a condition in a license, the type of program that is going to be produced?

MR HALL: Within certain general limiting terms I think the thing can be confined sufficiently enough to ensure that the public are not going to be deluged with a series of horrors one after the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supposing you had a condition in your license that horror plays cannot occupy more than ten per cent of the time, would you let Macbeth and King Lear in on that or not? They are pretty average horrors.

MR HALL: I think they go in the same category that is just a personal opinion.

MR. SIMPSON: I think the main idea behind this is, as I understand it, a radio station in order to get a license must endeavour to put on a certain number of public service programmes and also that there be sufficient financial backing that there will be adequate equipment for the showing of their programmes and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is much trouble about adequate money or financial stability or resources, but the thing that is worrying me personally on this suggestion as to its practicability, is whether you can in fact ensure a type of programme by means of advance conditions. Let me illustrate the type of thing.

Hal
C/2

I is perhaps a little easier to do it in radio
t the same kind of thing applies if you have a
nadian resident sitting in a studio and putting on
ramophone records, is that a Canadian programme or
it not? If the gramophone records happen to
pressed in Canada, even though they are written
the States, is that a Canadian programme or not?
television the same kind of business, because there
e always disc jockey programmes on television as
ell, but are those all Canadian programmes? Would
ey satisfy the rule that fifty per cent of the
ogramme content should be Canadian?

MR. HALL: I think the answer, Mr. Chairman,
as to do with the kind of thing being provided. Sup-
osing that the disc jockey programme presents ten
op tunes of Canada; that is Canadian, I think, even
ough the songs may have been written in the States
nd originally produced in the States, but if those
en top tunes are part of the Canadian people then
think it is Canadian in nature.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only trying to raise
he question with you to test your suggestion as to
hether or not it really is possible for second out-
ets for television, whether it is possible to control
he programme content by regulations attached to the
erms of the licence?

MR. HALL: I think that in a certain
ense it is possible to do so. I think, as Mr.
impson has said, a certain amount of time which the

rivate television stations are going to use must be giving a priority to public service items, the carrying of matters of national and international concern and so forth. I think within the Terms of Reference these things could be fully stipulated.

MR. SIMPSON: I think our experience has been pretty general with the private stations, that they have played ball. There are certain ideals, principles, certain basic principles, and in my own experience -- I live in the City of Sydney, we have a CBC station and a private station, and we have had a very happy relationship with the private station. We have private TV and the standard of programme is maintained well. The important thing is that in granting a licence consideration be given to, perhaps, the people behind it and their whole attitude towards the performance of what they are doing, and with that in mind and certain basic principles, we cannot regulate programmes in detail, nobody can, but certain basic principles that are understood and accepted I do not think will be too much of a problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, I do not want to cast any doubt on the validity of what you are saying, but as in radio this suggestion of the existing private television station in Sydney would be no test of this second station because the present private station in Sydney is in fact getting a very substantial part of its programmes

om the CBC. As in radio, the second station in
lifax, for instance, would not be getting any
C programmes, in all probability.

MR. SIMPSON: Will you not probably
me to the point in that situation where you have
at we have in radio? You have Trans-Canada and
minion networks and private radio is getting a great
al of its material from the CBC. Is that not
obably the ultimate end?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know. I think
ere are two things which have been put to us, one
the notion of a second network similar to the
minion network on television, and we were told this
rning that maybe this should not all happen at
ce, so you are going to have a peculiar network;
u are going to have it at Toronto and Winnipeg
d Halifax and then Vancouver, and in those circum-
ances it is not much of a network. The other
y is, they say that the channels are there so
y not leave it to private enterprise to develop
em, run it themselves, and they do not expect
ything from the CBC. That is the point put to
s. Now, in that case it has been argued, and I
ake it you are arguing here, that there should be
me programme control?

MR. SIMPSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In so far as one
emark you made on the public service needs and regu-
ations to see that private stations maintain public

rvice in the local and national interest, I think
is only fair to say that there are no regulations
verning that in radio, yet we have sufficient proof
ing around the country and through the numerous
tters we have received from all over the country
at the private stations, without regulation, have
en very conscious of their duty to the public, and
ve contributed very heavily in local matters and
ving free advertising for a variety of things. I
ink there is a consciousness there that we do not
ve to recognize by regulation.

MR. HALL: Within the broad objects of our
deration there are certain things we would hate to see;
r instance, racial discrimination or intolerance.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, that is
l covered in the regulations now.

MR. HALL: We feel that the licence for
anting a TV private station ought to come under
ese headings and they ought to be protected.

MR. COYNE: Do I understand from one of
ur earlier answers that your point is really this,
at once additional TV stations are being licensed
ere should be developed for television, which they
e not now, regulations more or less along the same
nes as are now in existence for radio networks?
ey are not formal regulations respecting tele-
sion at the moment.

MR. HALL: That is our feeling, that there
ould be a series of regulations similar to those in
dio.

MR. COYNE: That is, regulating a number f spot announcements and the use of recordings?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You are thinking of the develop-ent of television along lines similar to radio?

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have asked our uestions as we went along. We want to thank you oth for coming and presenting your brief and answer-ng the questions.

(Page 3556 follows)

DD
Hal
6/20

SUBMISSION OF
ATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON SCHOOL BROADCASTING

ppearances:

Dr. H. P. Moffatt

Mr. T. V. Dobson

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of he National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting. r. Moffatt, we are very glad to have you here; would ou please introduce your associate, and we will start y marking your brief as Exhibit No. 142.

XHIBIT NO. 142: Brief of The National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting

DR. MOFFATT: My associate is Mr. Dobson, member of the staff of the CBC, but here in his apacity as Acting Secretary of the National Advisory ouncil.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will be pleased to have ou present this brief in whatever way seems best to ou. I certainly would suggest that at the very east you summarize it.

DR. MOFFATT: It had been my intention, r. Chairman, to speak briefly to items Nos 1 to 5 nclusive, and to read from item No. 6 on, but I nderstand this morning a question was asked about ational school broadcasts and the status of the lational Advisory Council, so I am going to still peak to the five points, but I will speak more

ully than I originally intended.

In presenting this brief as chairman of the National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting, this Council was established in 1943 by agreement between the Canadian Education Association and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I have to go further for you and identify the Canadian Education Association because I think this is relevant. It is a voluntary body of educators in Canada, representing all the provinces of Canada, supported by the provincial governments of Canada. All ten provinces contribute to it and its major funds are secured from the provincial governments. It is governed by a Board of Directors on which the deputy ministers of the provinces are all represented. The Province of Quebec has three representatives, the Superintendent of Education, who is above the deputy minister level, and the Protestant Secretary and the Catholic Secretary. The Board of Directors of this Canadian Education Association acts on matters of policy of this kind, such as the establishment of this Council, and it acts as the Security Council acts in the United Nations; an outright nay means we don't do it. We can say that the National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting and the record of national school broadcasts that came from it were done with the unanimous consent of the provincial Departments of Education in Canada. The Council itself is

a representative body of all the provinces. There is one representative from each provincial Department of Education, and two from the Province of Quebec; one representative appointed by each of the departments of education. There were two in Quebec, one representing the Protestant and the other the Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic representative is presently retired and has not yet been replaced. There are two representatives on the Council from all the major educational organizations in Canada. There are two trustee representatives permitted on the board, one from the Canadian School Trustees' Association, and one trustee representing a branch of the Catholic trustees, but no such person has ever acted although there is such framework for such a person to be appointed.

With respect to school broadcasts themselves, they are, as the definition says at the bottom of the page:

> "A school broadcast is defined as a radio or television programme planned by educational experts" -- I don't like the word -- "to assist teachers in their classroom work, and presented over the air at times which suit the needs of school students" -- normally during school hours.

There are two general types of broadcast.

he first are the so-called national school broad-
asts, which are planned by the National Advisory
ommittee, produced by the CBC and emanate usually
rom Toronto, but not necessarily; the national school
roadcasts have emanated from other parts of Canada --
s a matter of fact, from Halifax right through to
ancouver. The national school broadcasts are three
ifferent types. First of all they are school broad-
asts related generally to the school curriculum in
he provinces. The first type are broadcasts re-
ating to Canadian life. If I may use a phrase that
ou used, Mr. Chairman, they interpret Canada to
anadians through the schools, and I should like to
ead the summary of the programmes of the current
chool year:

Voice of the Wild, which is the wild
nimals representing Canada as a whole and not just
f any particular region: Advances in Reading,
hich are book reviewers intending to stimulate
eading, with three Canadian books -- Great
anadian Journeys, March of the One Thousand, and
o on: Canadian Achievements: Men of Medicine,
ir Frederick Banting; Singing into Fame, by Lois
arshall. All these programmes are essentially
anadian in their nature and are intended to inter-
ret Canada to the students. One we are bringing
o next year is The Northland, which is of great
nterest to all Canadians, and there is a whole
eries of broadcasts on that. The second type of

programmes are intercommonwealth programmes, which we get from Great Britain and Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth. The third type are general cultural programmes which need the facilities of a larger studio or better facilities than are available in the provinces. For example, each year we put on a full Shakespeare play which is produced in Toronto. This year we have a production of H.M.S. Pinafore, and the year previous it was a programme requiring the use of a full orchestra and the interpretation of the orchestra by the leader to the children. Those are the three types: the ones intended to give a greater knowledge of Canada, the Commonwealth broadcasts and cultural broadcasts that require more extensive and superior production facilities.

The second general type of school broadcasts are those put on by the individual provinces, either individually or in co-operation with other provinces. In the Atlantic area the four provinces co-operate and plan these broadcasts. They are then produced by the CBC and go over CBC and private networks, and I will be speaking further about networks.

In all there are roughly 1200 school broadcasts going over the air in the current year.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation spends roughly $200,000 on those broadcasts in terms of services. The Departments of Education contribute

n equal amount, because in the local broadcasts they ay the performers, the musicians, the actors and cript writers and so on, and they also pay grants to he schools for the purchase of receivers. Roughly 400,000 a year is spent on these broadcasts, and hat is exclusive of programme time. No calculation s made of the cost of programme time which is given ree by the CBC and by the co-operating private stations

It so happens, Mr. Chairman, with respect o the value of school broadcasts, there is a very appy coincidence: there has recently been a survey f radio in Canadian schools, and this is submitted s an appendix to the brief. There is a very careful nd elaborate statistical study of school broadcasts n English-speaking Canada. The French-speaking chools were not covered in the study.

THE CHAIRMAN: This was prepared by whom?

DR. MOFFATT: The Canadian Teachers' ederation, and I think a study of it would prove he sampling has been carefully chosen and its re- ults are valid. It shows roughly speaking that 5 per cent of the schools in English-speaking anada have radio. Of those 80 per cent use the roadcasts, which means that 60 per cent of all the chools in English-speaking Canada use the school roadcasts. With respect to individual teachers, 9 per cent of the teachers are in a school in hich a radio is available. Thirty-five per ent of those use the broadcasts, which means that

31 per cent of all teachers use the broadcasts. I may say in this connection that may seem a low proportion, but our broadcasts do not reach high school students at all, or to a very limited degree, and do not reach to any great extent the primary grade. The broadcasts range generally from Grades 3 to 7, and within that range probably more than 31 per cent of the teachers use them. It is estimated that the listening audience throughout the year to school broadcasts was roughly 800,000 students. The survey also shows that in terms of teachers' own judgments they believe school broadcasts are meeting their objectives. That is referred to at the bottom of page 3. There is rather an elaborate reference to the extent to which teachers believe the objectives are achieved in this larger volume.

I speak briefly now on the television experience which has been referred to, and I want to express the fact that it is still an experiment. Again at the request of the Canadian Education Association, which means again that it was unanimous on the part of all the provinces, the CBC was asked to explore the possibilities of television in the classroom. That request came from the educators themselves and did not originate from the CBC. There have been three experiments: first, an experiment in out-of-school listening where the broadcasts were given out of school and the children were asked to report on them in school. Secondly,

DD
Hal
6/20

ne in November 1954 which was a full scale experi-
ent on broadcasting in schools over a fairly wide
ange of school subjects, and which was reported on
ully in a book called Television in the Classroom,
ubmitted as an appendix. Just completed about a
onth ago is the main experiment in which we broadened
he range of the subjects downward and upward -- that
s, in terms of grade levels -- and broadened it also
n terms of subjects covered. We tried to cover
ubjects not covered in the previous experiment. The
ain objective of the second experiment was to dis-
over the extent to which, if at all, television has
uperior to the sound film. That has been referred
o quite extensively, that television and sound were
perating in the same field, and this was specifically
lesigned to see to what extent it is superior or is
ot superior to the sound film. The second one has
ot yet been evaluated, and the Council will report
n it in the winter.

(Page 3564 follows)

MR. MOFFATT: I would just like to say there are serious problems in connection with having a general coverage, either nationally or provincially, in television because of the costs involved, the cost of production and the cost of reception. There is as yet no policy on the part of any of the provinces with respect to asking the CBC to integrate a national series of television telecasts. As a matter of fact, it is coming up before the proceedings of the CEA in September, there is a special report.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose no policy has been formed about installing television receivers in schools?

MR. MOFFATT: No, the two have to be taken together because the expense is involved not only in the production but in the reception as well, so there is no policy as yet either in the CBC or in the provinces with respect to television. Now, I would like to read from Item 6, perhaps abbreviating some parts.

> "The existing service of school radio broadcasts has proved of special value to rural areas, where it helps to equalize educational opportunities, as between town and country. In one province (Newfoundland) the broadcasts are now being specifically used to counteract the shortage of qualified teachers in the senior grades.

"Adequate network coverage (both local and national) is essential to the maintenance of this important educational service. The main purpose of this brief is to direct the Royal Commission's attention to the need of protection for this coverage.

"Unlike other public services of the CBC, school broadcasts have never been placed in 'reserved time'. Coverage has been achieved on a voluntary basis, through the persuasive talents of the CBC Station Relations Division, and through the acceptance by private station owners of their responsibilities for bringing school broadcasts to their local community, as a public service.

"This method has been on the whole successful up to the present. Today school broadcasts are carried over the largest network set up for any regularly scheduled programme in Canada. The network for the national school broadcasts for 1955-56 consists of 57 stations, including affiliates of both the Trans-Canada and Dominion networks of the CBC. Of these 57 stations, 40 are privately owned. Of these 40, 12 have been providing this service

EE
Hal
5/20

without interruption since the commencement of national school broadcasting in 1943. Twenty-one others have carried the programmes continuously for the past six to twelve years.

"The total network for the provincial school broadcasts was 60 stations, for the school year 1955-56.

"besides providing gratuitously this coverage, many individual private stations have also helped school broadcasting by furnishing facilities for programme originations and recordings, and by promotional activities. On numerous occasions, the Chairman of the National Advisory Council has expressed, by letter to the private stations, the appreciation felt by the educators of Canada for these services.

"However, this satisfactory state of affairs must be viewed as subject to two important qualifications. These are:

1. The existence of serious gaps in the existing coverage.
2. The absence of any guarantee that the present coverage will be maintained. In fact, there are already signs that it is likely to deteriorate.

These qualifications require further

consideration."

The first type of gap is that where areas are beyond the reach of any station at all and therefore we think it is a proper function of the CBC eventually to establish transmitters and stations to reach those remote areas. In respect to the second, where there is a local station affiliated with the CBC and unwilling to carry the broadcasts, I will briefly summarize page 6 and part of page 7 by indicating that there are gaps in various parts of the country;in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario which is rather strange and hard to believe, and in Saskatchewan and the Atlantic area. Since this brief was written there has been an indication that one more station in British Columbia, CJAT, at Trail might drop out of the network.

The network for national school broadcasts has already declined from its highest peak of 59 stations in 1953-54, to 57 stations for the current school year 1955-56.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt to ask you if that is causing a coverage decline?

MR. MOFFATT: I would have to ask Mr. Dobson that question.

MR. DOBSON: There is a certain variation each year, there will be one station drop off and another -- it is a net loss.

MR. MOFFATT: That does not mean loss of coverage.

MR. DOBSON: Yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It increases the number of gaps?

MR. DOBSON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We were given the case of one or two stations that dropped out in Saskatchewan and I talked to these stations at one stage and they said they dropped out because the existing CBC station was in fact covering and therefore there was a duplicate coverage.

MR. DOBSON: The drop of the two stations stated there was an area in British Columbia, it is in one of the valley areas and it does not receive coverage from any station, and the other is Calgary where it gets to the outskirts but not into the city where the majority of the schools are located.

MR. MOFFATT: "There are signs that further deterioration may occur in the future, for the following reasons.

"The distribution of school radio broadcasts is affected, as other radio programmes have been affected, by the growth of television. Television has attracted national sponsors away from evening periods on the Trans-Canada and Dominion networks. Thereby privately owned radio stations have lost revenue. Consequently their management has tended to place greater emphasis upon selling daytime periods to commercial sponsors.

"In some other instances, the same

tendency has led to re-scheduling or dropping the school broadcasts, which are confined to daytime periods. As the competition for the advertiser's dollar becomes keener, the position of school broadcasts is liable to suffer further.

"Obviously school broadcasts are only effective, if scheduled in school hours, and at times which (so far as possible) do not overlap with lunch or recess periods, or with school closing hours. These times are settled, in the first instance, by agreement between the CBC and the Department of Education for the province. However, when local stations, to suit their own commercial commitments, re-schedule school broadcasts, they often select periods which in fact do not suit the schools. An extreme example of this was the case of an Ontario station which, unknown to the CBC, delayed the school broadcasts to 4.30 p.m. -- an hour after the local schools closed.

"In some cases, local station managers have satisfied themselves, by conducting a local 'survey' or poll, that teacher opinion favours the re-scheduling they desire to make. Such station-conducted

surveys are usually carried through without the co-operation of the local school board, or the knowledge of the Department of Education. They have little objective value."

There is an example given here but we have two others. We have one recently in the New Glasgow area in Nova Scotia, and the example of the Trail station which is proposing to drop out this year, which we can give further details on if necessary. We feel these stations conduct these surveys and seek the people who will give them the answers they want, to drop the programme or make a change in the hours.

"Some station managers will go to considerable lengths to avoid the loss of commercial revenue involved in carrying the school broadcasts. For example, one station came to an agreement with the local board of education (according to the station) whereby the school system would be supplied with a number of tape recorders. The station undertook to record the school broadcasts on tape from the network line and distribute copies to the schools. In several other places, local stations have volunteered to provide schools with disc recordings of school broadcasts. In both instances, incidentally, such action would involve violation of authors' and artists' copyrights.

"There have also been a few instances where the radio station has offered to pay line charges to enable school broadcasts to be fed directly to local schools without consuming air time. Apart from other objections to these proposals, they all suffer from one serious drawback. They offer to provide programmes to only a small portion of the station's school broadcast audience, and neglect completely the rural and urban schools on the perimeter of the station's coverage area.

"The examples quoted here are not typical of privately owned stations in general. The great majority of stations, as has been indicated earlier, have been most generous in sacrificing commercial considerations to school needs, and in continuing to carry the school broadcasts as asked, in spite of any loss of revenue that may result.

"However, as is often the case, the selfish action of a very few stations is enough to force others to abandon their more generous attitude, through mere pressure of competition.

"In the light of these considerations, there can be little doubt that school broadcasts face a difficult future in the matter

of securing adequate coverage by voluntary means. Since the school boards have made a large capital investment in equipping their schools to receive the broadcasts, and since both the CBC and the Department of Education spend annually considerable sums in providing the necessary programmes, it is essential to find some effective means of protecting the network coverage of school broadcasts. How can this best be done?

"Hitherto the school broadcasts have not been part of the contractual obligations of affiliated network stations, since the CBC has never placed them in 'reserve time'.

"Under present arrangements, stations affiliated with either of the two CBC networks are free to carry the school broadcasts. This has resulted in the programmes being carried on a network which is larger than either the Trans-Canada or the Dominion network, singly. However, if the programme were placed in 'reserve time', probably they would be restricted to a single network and, if so, coverage would be considerably smaller.

"The question then inevitably arises -- how far should the CBC go in requiring private stations to carry the school broadcasts?

"So far, the CBC Station Relations Department has relied on persuasion only. In

some important cases, namely Calgary, persuasion has failed. But the Corporation possesses powers which could be used to compel any station to carry these programmes.

"Under the Canadian Broadcasting Act, Section 21(1), 'the Corporation may make regulations (b) to prescribe the periods to be reserved periodically by any private station for the broadcasting of the programmes of the Corporation'.

" Further, the CBC Regulations for sound broadcasting stations say under Section 11(1): 'The periods to be reserved by a private station for the broadcast of programmes of the Corporation are such as may be agreed upon between the station and the Corporation, or as may be designated by the Corporation by notice in writing to the station'.

"Up to the present, the latter part of this regulation (as underlined by us) has never been enforced by the Corporation, no doubt because of a desire to avoid offending any station. However, in our opinion, the time has come when the Corporation should feel prepared to invoke its powers under this regulation, and to insist that, in any important area where coverage for school broadcasts is lacking through the refusal of a local station to carry the programmes, such

station should reserve appropriate time for these programmes."

I must qualify that unqualified statement. Since this brief was prepared and presented to you we have had a dissenting opinion from the Alberta Department of Education; they do not agree in full with the last statement and they would prefer, where coverage is not carried through private stations, instead of using the authority under Section 11(1), the CBC shall use their facilities and see that these broadcasts are sent out in that way in the Calgary area.

THE CHAIRMAN: That they build a special station for two or three hours a week?

MR. MOFFATT: I have not the text of the letter.

MR. DOBSON: The text of the letter would indicate that but our knowledge of previous conversations with them would indicate that they are thinking of something more than school broadcasts. The Alberta Government have concerned themselves with the situation for quite some time, and it is a larger thing than that.

MR. MOFFATT: "The above recommendation should be effective in dealing with the situation so long as the CBC retains its present regulatory authority over all stations. But in the light of the Commission's Terms of Reference, there is also the possibility that some modification or alteration of regulatory system might be

recommended. In that case, a new situation would be created, so far as school broadcasting is concerned.

"If any body, other than the CBC, were given regulatory powers over broadcasting, it would be desirable that such body should be given a mandate to protect the coverage of school broadcasts, both nationally and regionally. Such body should have powers similar to those indicated in CBC Regulation Section 11(1), and should be instructed to use them where necessary.

"Should this not be done, we submit that there is serious danger that, in course of time, the network for school broadcasts might diminish to a point where the Departments of Education would feel that not sufficient coverage was being obtained to justify their continued expenditure on programmes. In this way the whole edifice of school broadcasting in Canada, constructed during the past fifteen years and brought to a high degree of effectiveness and recognized value among our teachers, could be imperilled.

"The National Advisory Council on School Broadcasting earnestly requests the Royal Commission to give consideration to the needs of school broadcasting, in framing its recommendations for the future."

I should like to add a few words further that are not in the brief. The educators of Canada

hrough the National Advisory Council, are asking in ffect that the CBC use its coercive powers to make ure the school broadcasts continue to be received ationally and provincially. I think the survey ade by the Canadian Teachers Federation indicates hat there is some responsibility on the CBC and on he Departments of Education themselves to see to it hat they shoulder some share of the task of seeing hat adequate reception is given. It has been ndicated, for instance, that there are some diffi- ulties, not serious, in the programmes or schedule, nd those difficulties can be corrected too,in some ases, getting better coverage. I think that is p to the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a way of doing it?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes. The second thing is hat others have a duty to stimulate the use of broad- asting through grants for receivers and to stimulate he use of broadcasts in the sense that where they onsider it desirable it should be put in, and this an be done through inspectors and by other means. I eel myself there is just enough in the contention of ome of the stations that the broadcasting audience is mall, and that there is a strong responsibility on he departments to see to it that the school broad- asts are used to their maximum of effectiveness. I am not sure that has been done in all cases. I just wanted to add, it is not in the brief, that there s a responsibility on the CBC to do all they can to

nprove the programmes and the scheduling and on the
epartments to make sure that where the programmes
re useful and desirable that they should receive
ne maximum use.

-

-

-

(Page 3578 follows)

-

-

-

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us, just o complete the record, how many hours a week these rovincial broadcasts are on, and how many minutes a eek this national broadcast is on?

MR. MOFFATT: In respect of the national roadcasts it is one half-hour a week; in respect f the provincial broadcasts it varies according to he area. In the Atlantic area, Monday through hursday, fifteen minutes in the morning and fifteen n the afternoon; in some of the other provinces, alf an hour in the morning or in the afternoon. r. Dobson could probably give greater detail. The rovincial broadcasts vary; the national broadcasts, alf an hour a week on Friday mornings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it fair to say that pproximately half an hour on the provincial ---

MR. MOFFATT: They are Monday through hursday.

MR. DOBSON: With some slight variations.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that you have got a total f three hours a week on the average during the school ear?

MR.DOBSON: I would say two and a half; here are five school days.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us how any private stations are used as outlets for these roadcasts?

MR. MOFFATT: It is in the brief.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, that is just to

ntroduce my next question.

MR. MOFFATT: Page 7 of the brief.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Fifty-six or fifty-seven?

MR. MOFFATT: Of those fifty-seven, forty are privately owned.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And do you have any idea how much it would cost to purchase the time on these private stations?

MR. MOFFATT: I have not.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Have you made inquiries?

MR. MOFFATT: No.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Because it just leads me to another question: you are complaining that there are gaps in coverage, and you suggest that if CBC cannot convince the private stations to carry these broadcasts they should use their power to force the private stations. Is there not the other alternative, that the Departments of Education could buy the time on these private stations?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes, sir, I had thought of that. The fact is that from the inception of school broadcasts, which began in some of the provinces in the twenties -- in this province in about 1928 -- the radio time has been donated free to the extent we have been spoiled. To make an abrupt transition from free time given to us on all occasions to paying for time is something that would give us considerable pause. It would be the view of the Departments of Education that giving free time

for school broadcasts is within the definition of Public Service. I don't know to what extent stations are required to give public service, and in the field of public service it is a matter of degree, and we feel school broadcasts would rate very high in the list in the matter of giving public service.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I quite appreciate that as a public service the private broadcaster would like to give this time free to the various Departments of Education, but going one step further and forcing them to subsidize education in any province is making quite a big step in the direction of public service.

MR. MOFFATT: There are many who do; the minority do not.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But do you have any idea of the amount of money that it would represent to purchase the time, even in gross figures?

MR. MOFFATT: I haven't, no.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would it be in the neighbourhood of the $200,000 that you have mentioned as being the contribution of the Departments of Education, or would it be much lower or much higher?

MR. MOFFATT: I really don't know.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have no idea?

MR. MOFFATT: I don't know.

THE CHAIRMAN: One thing is probably certain, and that is the moment you start buying any time you will buy it all.

MR. MOFFATT: Yes. I recognize as an alternative the Department of Education could pay for

all the time including the time given by the CBC.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Coming back to this question of gaps in coverage; it has been indicated to us that whenever there are gaps it is due in large measure to the fact that the receivers are not adequate in the area that is not properly covered.

MR. MOFFATT: That is the contention of some of the school broadcasters. Others make no contention; they say, "Regardless of the listening audience we discontinued them, notwithstanding, because we cannot afford to lose that much revenue." In the Saint John Valley one of the stations there, the one in Fredericton, doesn't carry the national school broadcast on Friday, though it carries the provincial ones Monday through Thursday, because it is half an hour at 11.15 and they can't schedule it. They discontinued that national broadcast notwithstanding the rather substantial audience for purely commercial reasons. So, they may discontinue it for purely commercial reasons, or because they think there is not a sufficient audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. de Grandpre's question was slightly different from the information you gave us. I think he was putting to you the contention that the mechanical gaps in the coverage -- not the cases where stations won't carry the service, but mechanical gaps in places where, partly, at least, it is due to the inadequacy of the receiving sets in certain schools . . .

MR. MOFFATT: I see, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: . . . instead of having more efficient, powerful receiving sets.

MR. MOFFATT: I have no information on that.

MR. DOBSON: I can see certainly this does bear on the case. In certain areas that is quite true, and the complaint has been investigated and has been found to be so. However, in many of the gaps mentioned here -- and I think the Council has endeavoured to keep free of any of those rather contentious ones -- in many of the gaps listed here it is an actual absence of coverage; they can't get any reception whatsoever, or they can get it in such a way that it is not useful in a school classroom, and it must be true that listening to a school broadcast is very much different from listening to an entertainment programme in your own living room where you are within two or three feet of your receiver and your room is acoustically quite satisfactory.

MR. de GRANDPRE: There is another alternative which comes to my mind, and that is the possibility of finding sponsors for school broadcasts. I know this would be a contentious matter, but could you give us your comments on the advisability or possibility of finding sponsors?

MR. MOFFATT: Both the Canadian Education Association and the National Advisory Council have discussed this particular point, and unanimously agree that the school broadcasts should not be sponsored for many reasons. It is a government

service; education is free, and we do not want it associated in any way with any particular seller of a private product. We take the same view in regard to sponsorship. A question came up in connection with broadcasts carried by the Provincial Department of Education in British Columbia which were sponsored by an oil company of the United States. It came up last winter before the Council and they unanimously agreed that the CBC should not give free radio time to school broadcasts. That was our advice to the CBC and I think the CBC asked us to consider that particular problem. The recommendation of the Council was that it should not be done.

(Page 3584 follows)

MR. de GRANDPRE: What I cannot understand is the difference between direct sponsoring of the broadcast and indirect sponsoring of the broadcast by the broadcasters themselves. The broadcasters to a certain extent indirectly sponsor the programme by giving their time on their station, and you do not seem to object to that but, to the contrary, when it comes to direct sponsoring by a commercial firm then apparently your Association has very definite views against it?

MR. MOFFATT: We do not feel that the name of any particular product should be associated with material coming into classrooms; that is the objection to direct sponsorship. In the other case, we take the view that all radio stations, whether public or private, have a certain obligation to the public and it is a matter of degree. We think our school broadcasts rank high in public service broadcasts, but we would not want that carried to the absurdity that they had so much public service that they could not make a living. It is a question of how much public service time they can afford and it is our contention that our broadcasts rank high in the public service broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are ready to accept public service from a privately owned radio station but not from a privately owned oil company?

MR. MOFFATT: That is right.

MR. DOBSON: A privately owned oil company

ill beat its drums but not a private radio station.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had some drum beating y private radio stations.

MR. DOBSON: But not in the classroom.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before we get off hat subject, am I correct in assuming that the hours nd the material that goes over the air is entirely at he discretion of the teacher?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes, it is entirely at the discretion of the teacher. The teacher may be subject o influence from her principal or school board, she is n employee of the school board, a local authority. I do not know whether they in fact do that; the school rincipal or the inspector may suggest that she use his or that broadcast that might improve her teaching r there is an opportunity to enlarge her scope or each a subject on which she is not well prepared, but n the last analysis the decision is on the individual eacher as to whether she does or does not use it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, the use of his material is entirely voluntary; would it not be ight to make it mandatory on certain stations to arry this material? You have a voluntary situa- ion on one hand, you are suggesting a mandatory ituation on the other.

MR. MOFFATT: There is a difference. If o radio station carries the broadcast nobody can isten, nobody at the other end can exercise his hoice, the programme must be on the air in the

irst instance and our concern is to see they are
n the air, and once on the air it is then up to the
chool authorities as to whether they use them. As
indicated in the latter part of my remarks -- not
n the brief -- I think it is the responsibility of
he school board to see that use is made of these
roadcasts which emanate from the CBC.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You would not go
urther than that, that there is -- make it mandatory
nd I think you would be on better ground than asking
omebody to give up time that is valuable to them.

MR. MOFFATT: Well, if it were mandatory,
eaching is a professional act and where the person who
s exercising the act must have a certain amount of
hoice just as doctors, lawyers and other profes-
ional people.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask the
ame kind of question Mr. Stewart was asking. Here
ou have an undertaking, which I take it has the
rtual unanimous approval of the deputy ministers of
ducation of this country, they think it is a good
hing?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, is it not true that
our Department of Education in the province specify
hat teachers will teach a certain amount of reading,
riting and arithmetic?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why should they not say that
hey shall listen to these desirable school broadcasts?

MR. MOFFATT: I was going to say the anner in which the teacher teaches reading or spelling nd so on is left to the teacher's discretion; we do ot say that they must teach one thing one week and o on, because they have their students there with arying capacities and their own background of know- edge, and the two have to be confined in a professional ct in which choice is a very strong element. The rovince lays down the course of study in general, ut a teacher well trained in the field of music who as capabilities in his field may do as well, perhaps etter, in the field of music than by using the school roadcasts, but a teacher deficient in that would rovide it by using it. Then there are other things ike social studies, where all teachers may use it, anadian Journeys and so on, that might be beyond heir range of knowledge and would add to their com- etence. There has to be in the use of broad- asting an element of choice on the part of the eacher in relation to her own background of train- ng and what she can do. Unless it can be done on voluntary basis it would not achieve its maximum esults.

(Page 3588 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Take your Early Travels in anada: isn't it possible for the provincial authori- ies to say this is the kind of programme they think hould be carried, that this is something that all hildren should have?

MR. DOBSON: It is possible, yes. It is ithin the power of the Department to say that.

THE CHAIRMAN: My last question was that the echnical power exists in the provincial school system o compel this if that is felt to be desirable.

MR. MOFFATT: Yes. We have to take a ery broad interpretation of our Act. The Governor n Council has the power to. They would be exer- ising the power very much in detail; we don't do t in that much detail.

MR. de GRANDPRE: If the CBC were to compel he stations to carry these broadcasts, would this ompulsion apply to all private stations whether they e affiliated to the Trans-Canada or the Dominion etworks or even if fully independent and not ffiliated in any manner whatsoever with any network; hey would still be compelled to carry these broad- asts?

MR. MOFFATT: I don't know the terms nder which any station gets its licence. I assume ny station, whether affiliated or non-affiliated, as to undertake some public service, so it would e my view that the CBC might exercise its power n respect of any station, depending on whether it as necessary.

MR. DOBSON: The point is "where necessary".

MR. de GRANDPRE: Whenever necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are suggesting it se a power which is not based on a condition of the icence.

MR. de GRANDPRE: It is based on Section 1(1)(b) of the Act. I was asking the question because f the sentence on the top of page 10 that says:

> "However, if the programmes were placed in 'reserve time', probably they would be restricted to a single network and, if so, coverage would be considerably smaller."

his is the first alternative that you had in mind, nd then the second alternative would be compulsion n all stations?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Just a last question to omplete the record: you state on page 3 in the fourth aragraph:

> "School broadcasts in Canada have a large adult audience, principally among parents."

o you have any surveys showing the percentage of arents listening to these school broadcasts?

MR. MOFFATT: A survey was conducted y the Canadian Association of Home and School ssociations, and they presented the results of that urvey to the National Council. A copy of that

urvey could be filed with you if you would like to
ave it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we probably have it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Yes, it is filed, but it
s that I don't understand the percentage.

MR. MOFFATT: All we say on page 3 is that
chool broadcasts have a large adult audience, par-
icularly among parents, and that is what the survey
f the Canadian Home and School and Parent-Teacher
ederation showed, that there was a substantial home
udience amongst parents listening to the broadcasts
ust for their own information.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Would the percentage
efer to the number of families having children of
chool age, or would it apply to all families?

MR. MOFFATT: That I don't know.

MR. de GRANDPRE: . . . in any given area?

MR. MOFFATT: I don't know.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we can find this
ut.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I didn't know whether
r. Moffatt had the answer.

MR. DOBSON: I haven't the answer, but I
o know the various regular radio audience surveys
hich are done will provide certainly one answer to
hat. It may not be the whole answer because they
re not wholly reliable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two ques-
ions. I am not exactly clear as to the National

dvisory Council on School Broadcasts, as to whether
t is an advisory council to the CBC in some ways,
ike the Religious Advisory Council that came before
s in Toronto, or is it an independent body created
y this agreement between the Education Association
nd the CBC? What is its status? Is it a
ommittee of the CBC, in effect?

MR. MOFFATT: It is a committee of the CBC,
n effect. We advise the CBC on matters relating t
chool broadcasts. I am an appointee of the CBC;
he others are nominated according to this frame-
ork, by the various provinces.

THE CHAIRMAN: This falls within the powers
n the Broadcasting Act to appoint advisory councils
n special matters?

MR. MOFFATT: That is right.

MR. DOBSON: This was appointed at the
equest of the C.E.A..

THE CHAIRMAN: So that in a sense you are
art of the apparatus of the CBC?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

-

-

(Page 3592 follows)

-

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, I do not understand why if the school broadcasts, the national ones at least, and largely provincial too, are regarded as being worth $400,000 of public money -- what the reasons are , carrying it logically through to getting them across, getting them out. At the bottom of page 9 you say:

"Since the CBC has never placed them in 'reserve time'."

MR. MOFFATT: That was done because if it had been placed on reserve time, the implication being reserved time only on one network, as it is now we have a larger number of stations carrying it than either one of the networks taken individually.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if you are spending $400,000 worth of public money and all you produce is a desirable programme, whether it is reserve time or exercising regulations under 21(1), I do not see what the fears are, I do not know what they are as to why the coverage has not been achieved over that area.

MR. MOFFATT: Well, the coverage in the main station -- but we are afraid that under these new pressures that are developing for competition for daytime commercial programmes on the radio that the coverage will come to the point where it is no longer effective. It has been effective except in those areas where there is no coverage at all, but we are hopeful and wishfully thinking that we will get this free radio time as a public service and

on't have to pay for it as individual departments
f education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, what it really comes
o is, up till now,without reserve time compulsion or
hat have you, it has been reasonably successful?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are fearful of the
uture?

MR. MOFFATT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Tell me, a question
ust occurs to me: how does that work out in the
rovince of Quebec? You say there are 57 stations
n the country, 40 of which are private stations;
ould you break that down to the French network or
he Province of Quebec, how many CBC and how many
rivate stations are doing this?

MR. DOBSON: It is very small because
here are no French language school broadcasts in
he Province of Quebec.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: There are none?

MR. DOBSON: None.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: They have no
roadcasts?

MR. DOBSON: The Quebec Government has not
sked the CBC. The CBC's facilities are available
t any time that the Quebec Department of Education
n the French section asks them. In the English
ection they have arranged a co-operative agreement
ith Ontario to take the Ontario English broadcasts

i Quebec. Actually there are two stations on the
rench network which are carrying the English language,
Ctario and national school broadcasts; that is at
V.l d'Or and Rouyn, because of the English-speaking
ppulation there.

MR. MOFFATT: May I say also the Province
c' New Brunswick has part of its broadcasts in French
rom the Edmunston station.

MR. DOBSON: That is right, there are
tree French network stations which are carrying the
ew Brunswick French-language broadcasts.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are they private
roadcasters?

MR. DOBSON: Two are and one is the CBC
station in Moncton.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you both very much
or coming. That is the end of our briefs here
ad I want to express our appreciation to all those
no have prepared and taken the trouble to submit
riefs, and also submit to examination here. We
ppreciate the interest and the help, and will con-
ider all these briefs and also a number of others
hich have been sent in but not publicly presented.

Before we adjourn I would like again to
ut on record our appreciation for being able to
eet in this most pleasant room amid the beautiful
urroundings here. We will adjourn now to reopen
t Charlottetown at ten o'clock a.m. on Friday morning.

- - - - - -

23

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I. JUNE 22, 1956

V. 23

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

The Sittings of the Commission were held in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, in the City Hall, commencing at 10.00 A.M. on Friday, June 22, 1956.

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JOHN M. COYNE
	A.J. de GRANDPRE

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

UBMISSIONS BY:

THE ISLAND RADIO BROADCASTING COMPANY LIMITED.
Mr. R.F. Large.
Mrs. K.S. Rogers
Mr. Wm. Keith Rogers.

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE.
Mr. J.L. Dewar.

UBMISSIONS (cont'd):

THE CHARLOTTETOWN BOARD OF TRADE.
Mr. B. Rogers.
Mr. R.E. Taylor.
Mr. F.W. Hyndman.

HIS WORSHIP LIEUT. COLONEL J. DAVID STEWART,
D.S.O., E.D.

---On resuming at 10.00 A.M.:

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will open the hearings here in Charlottetown. We have four briefs to hear today, and I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to His Worship the Mayor and the City of Charlottetown for making this hearing room available to us. It is a very comfortable and pleasant place to have our hearings.

I should also say a word, as I usually do at the opening of a hearing, about our procedure. We like to have those who are presenting briefs outline them, at least, and perhaps read them if they prefer, and then we have questions from our counsel and members of the Commission. Those questions are merely designed to get at the exact submission and find out exactly what the sponsor of the brief is suggesting, to make sure that various points of view have been considered in the preparation of the brief, but no question should be taken as indicating any conclusions by the Commission; that will only be done when we have completed our public hearings and have studied the various special reports that are being made for us, and those will not all be in and all available until some time in the Fall.

The first brief is that of The Island Radio Broadcasting Company Limited. Mrs. Rogers, the President of the company, is here, Mr. Large, the General Manager, and Mr. Rogers also, to present this brief.

We will begin by marking it as Exhibit 143

i our hearings.

SUBMISSION OF THE ISLAND RADIO BROADCASTING COMPANY LIMITED.

PPEARANCES:

Mr. R.F. Large, Manager.

Mrs. K.S. Rogers, President.

Mr. Wm. Keith Rogers.

HIBIT NO. 143: Brief submitted by The Island Radio Broadcasting Company Limited, Charlottetown, P.E.I.

MR. LARGE: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, is brief is submitted by The Island Radio Broadcasng Company Limited, owners and operators of broadsting station CFCY radio and CFCY television. Our tent is to inform the Commission of the position CFCY Charlottetown in relation to the growth of e Canadian broadcasting industry.

We propose to do this by giving a brief story of the station, an outline of its public serce activities, and a statement on our position relave to the present broadcasting arrangements in fect in Canada.

CFCY Charlottetown was licensed 32 years o, in 1924, as a commercial broadcasting station the late Colonel K.S. Rogers, one of Canada's ading pioneers in the broadcasting industry. It worth noting that from early records of the

;ation it would appear that the inspiration to
ıstitute an experimental station about 1921 was
ıe result of Colonel Rogers (a private citizen)
ıdeavouring to supply a local (Canadian) broadcas-
ing service when reception from distant American
;ations was not satisfactory. It is from these early
xperimental broadcasts that CFCY was founded as a
·ivate commercial broadcasting station in 1924, with
power of 50 watts. In the year 1927 during the
ıbilee celebration of Canadian Confederation CFCY
·iginated a broadcast, from Charlottetown, to one
? the first Canadian networks. In 1932 CFCY became
member of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commis-
.on network, operating at that time with a power
ıtput of 500 watts. Until 1935 the operation of
ıe station had been from within the city limits of
ıarlottetown, but in this year a new transmitter
ıd transmitting towers were erected at a site out-
.de the city for operation of 1000 watts, with
udios and offices in the city. In 1937 CFCY com-
nced broadcasting on a schedule of sixteen hours
r day. During this period the station began
erating in conjunction with the network of the
nadian Broadcasting Corporation, which super-
ded the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission.
1942 the station occupied new studios and offices
its own building at 85 Kent Street. When per-
ssion was given in 1943 for the private broadcas-
ng stations of Canada to raise their own power
om 1000 to 5000 watts, CFCY Charlottetown was the

irst station in the Maritime Provinces to effect his increase. In 1950 the station built a completely new transmitting plant at North River, P.E.I., utilizing a directional antenna system, a new 5000 watt transmitter, a 5000 watt stand-by transmitter, and a diesel electric generating plant to insure uninterrupted service to the public.

It is interesting to note that until the establishing, in 1939, of a 50,000 watt station at Sackville, N.B., by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, CFCY Charlottetown was the most powerful outlet for Canadian radio network programmes heard throughout the central Maritime Provinces. Up until that time CFCY Charlottetown had carried all the major network programmes and broadcasts of national importance to this wide area which embraces a population of approximately half a million people. The coverage of the station not only included Prince Edward Island but large portions of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and as well, to certain areas of the Province of Quebec, and Newfoundland. However, in the year 1944, after the station at Sackville, N.B., had become established, CFCY, after building up an audience for a great number of years to many of the features that were then carried on the Canadian networks, was removed from the main network and affiliated with the secondary system which was formed about that time. It will be appreciated that apparently a great number of years' effort in building up an audience was in vain when these pro-

rammes and features were arbitrarily removed to the
0,000 watt station at Sackville, N.B.

It may be argued that this particular act
id not harm the station in a financial manner, and
n fact, this is so. However, there was an in-
angible loss of morale by the station in this par-
icular action. Through these years up to the present
ay the station has continued to expand its efforts
nd facilities to provide entertainment and service
o its listening audience, and occupies the position
f having the largest radio home circulation of any
rivate broadcasting station east of Montreal.

Throughout its history, CFCY has given
ull co-operation to the national system, not only
n providing distribution of programmes, but also
n originating many programmes from Charlottetown
o the national system. It is our desire to continue
his co-operation.

At the present time, this company is in-
olved in one of the most critical periods of its
istory. In our undertaking the construction of a
elevision station, we believe the Commission will
ppreciate the terrific problems, both economic and
therwise, that must be faced in this area of com-
aratively small population. Yet, this company
as recognized its place of responsibility to the
eople in the area we have been serving, and has
ow thrown all its resources into providing a
elevision service. Construction is now well ad-
anced and operation is expected in the near future.

The public service broadcasting activities
f CFCY Charlottetown have extended all the way from
nding stray cats and lost dogs to raising the sum
f approximately $10,000 in the March of Dimes
oliomyelitis Campaign in the year 1950. We have
ept a lighthouse keeper on a lonely island off the
oast of Cape Breton Island advised of the condition
f his wife who was having a baby on the Nova Scotia
inland. We have issued informal train orders to
art a train towards Charlottetown from the east end
f the province when all other forms of communica-
on were down. We have raised 80% of the funds
ecessary to purchase three Iron Lungs during a polio-
elitis epidemic in 1954. We have located innumer-
le missing children and persons. During the war
ars, airmen based at the Royal Air Force training
ation at Charlottetown used the signal of CFCY many
mes to "home" on the Charlottetown airport; indeed
a number of occasions the station was requested
remain on the air after its normal shutdown time
assist airmen back to base during periods of bad
ather.

These random and widely diversified examples
e mentioned purely to give the Commission an in-
ght into the type of public service a broadcasting
ation can give. We have assisted in the field
music development in our province by giving
very co-operation to the P.E.I. Musical Festival
sociation, in the way of broadcasting performances
om the Festival, and informative talks on the

ssociation's activity at other times of the year. e have worked in co-operation with the Little Theatre uild to awaken interest in the production of local adio plays, and to engender interest in the movement n general. Women's Institutes, agricultural rganizations, and similar groups, are given time hrough our broadcasting facilities to present infor- ation of interest to their members.

An annual event over CFCY for the past 20 ears has been a Radio Auction conducted by a local ervice club. During this period, through our facili- es, approximately $75,000 has been raised to assist he crippled children of Prince Edward Island.

For the past number of years, we have filed nnual Reports with the Canadian Broadcasting Corpora- on concerning our broadcasting activities. With hese reports it is our custom to attach a listing of he various organizations and movements given support hrough the public service facilities of CFCY harlottetown. And the listing is attached hereto.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't propose to read hat list, do you?

MR. LARGE: I think we will skip that, if ou don't mind.

We believe the broadcasting industry in anada should operate with a minimum of regulation, thin the framework of the laws of the land, under milar circumstances as the newspapers and other rms of publication. Consistent with meeting its bligations to the public, it should be free to

ogress as its experience, abilities, and resources
rmit.

The experience of this company over the
st 32 years leads us to believe that it is entirely
ssible to operate a commercial broadcasting service
th the objective of making an honest profit, and
the same time, give a public service. We strongly
fute any suggestions that may be made that it is
t artistic to operate on a business-like basis, and
the same time provide entertainment, information
d public service.

Our observation from over a quarter of a
ntury in contact with persons engaged in the Com-
rcial Broadcasting Industry in Canada is that
ey are just as loyal and just as sincere a group
Canadians as any others. In the first instance,
was private citizens who took the initiative in
oviding the original broadcasting services. Those
authority should be the first to encourage the
erprise of those Canadians who have given of
ir time, energy, and abilities to build an indus-
at a time when others were not interested in tak-
the risks involved. The private broadcasting
ustry of Canada has a right to be proud of its
ievements and we respectfully submit that it is
itled to equal stature in Canada with any other
tem that may exist.

We would like to state that we have no
ection to a Government subsidized radio and tele-
ion operation, as long as the independent

oadcasters may have the opportunity to progress
their abilities and resources permit.

As a member of the Canadian Association of
dio and Television Broadcasters, we have read, and
lly support, the brief being filed by that Associa-
on.

We believe that the recommendations of the
wler Commission on Broadcasting will set the pattern
broadcasting in Canada for many years to come.
reover, we feel that this Commission can go down
history as the body that recognized the achieve-
nts of the private broadcasting industry in this
untry, and that the need exists for a more democratic
oadcasting structure in Canada. We would, there-
re, ask the Commission to consider recommending that
e private broadcasting industry be given equal
ature with any other system that may exist in Canada,
d that all radio and television operations be placed
der the authority of an Independent Regulatory
oard, such board to be completely devoid of any
terest in the operation of radio and television
ations or networks.

Also we would ask the Commission to con-
der recommending that applications for non-Govern-
nt television stations be permitted in all areas
Canada.

May we assure the Commission of our com-
lete co-operation in supplying any further details
information that may be desired.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Large.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Large, you mention that FCY has the largest radio home circulation of any rivate broadcasting station east of Montreal. Would ou tell us what you mean by the "largest radio home irculation"?

MR. LARGE: It is the number of homes with adios within our coverage area and is measured by n independent survey organization known as the Bureau f Broadcast Measurement. It is an Association recog- ized by the industry, and a high percentage of the tations are members of the Association, and therefore hey are able to get the relative circulation of ach station.

MR. COYNE: This is a matter of potential udience coverage rather than ...

MR. LARGE: An exact one.

MR. COYNE: ... rather than to any particular rogramme?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

MR. COYNE : And you say it has the largest dio home circulation of any private broadcasting ation east of Montreal: I suppose CBA, with its 000 watts, is able to spread over a somewhat larger rea than you are?

MR. LARGE: That is so. Actually, our dio home circulation in the last figures is very ose to CBA.

MR. COYNE: But that is why you say "pri- te" broadcasting stations?

MR. LARGE: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: Turning, if you will, to part III your brief, in the first paragraph you say:

"We believe the broadcasting industry in "Canada should operate with a minimum of "regulation ..." :

wonder if you could tell us what you have in mind what you mean by "the minimum of regulation"?

MR. LARGE: Well, I think probably that can tied in with the phrase "consistent with meeting s obligations to the public". We feel there should t be any more regulation than is necessary to guard e public against any malpractices.

MR. COYNE: Is there at the present time, your view, more than a desirable minimum of regula-on?

MR. LARGE: In some instances I would say at is probably true.

MR. COYNE: Could you indicate the instances ere you feel we are over-regulated at the present me?

MR. LARGE: Well, there are regulations connection with political broadcasting, regula-ons perhaps in line with the number of announcements can broadcast during specific periods, and I would t like to go any further at the present time with-t going -- I would have to give you specific in-ances to actually tell you what we mean. Our intent this paragraph here is just to get over the idea at there should be the minimum number of regulations

at would protect the public.

MR. COYNE: As a matter of principle?

MR. LARGE: Yes, that is the intent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Large, we have had a mewhat similar position taken and a good deal of gic taken by many people, and I think, with the ssible exception of these political broadcast ints that you mentioned, I don't think we have been le to find much in the way of specific examples of er-regulation. If there is over-regulation we nt to hear about it. To give you the full picture, have had some representations saying that this is redundant regulation; this regulation that there ould not be obscenity on the air may sound redundant, t when you examine it it doesn't do anybody any rm to have it in the regulations as a sort of codi- cation of the law. The political one is perhaps little different because most of the political ones e not regulations but statutory provisions -- or, least, based on statutory provisions, and they are matter for Parliament to change rather than a matter regulation by C.B.C. However, if you have any ses of over-regulation we would be very glad indeed hear them.

MR. LARGE: The only comment I can make that, Mr. Fowler, would be that perhaps it is the terpretation of the regulation that may be impor- nt. Perhaps the people who are there now are terpreting them in the spirit of the law rather an to the letter, and I feel that is a very important

ctor in the whole interpretation of any set of rules
· regulations laid down. I would say that the
rsonalities of the present people who are interpre-
ng them and with the experience they have had,
uld allow us to expect a fairly reasonable inter-
etation, but there seems to be no guarantee that
future if the personalities of these people occupy-
g the various positions changes there would be no
arantee that there may not be some excessive inter-
etation laid down.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had it put by some
eople that the regulations are there but they are
t sufficiently enforced, which is the opposite
int of view to what you are putting forward. Isn't
at danger you speak of almost inescapable in any
man system of regulation?

MR. LARGE: That may be so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it any more than that? I
don't want to press you on it, but it seems to me
all can be worried about any political institu-
on we have, that if it got into the wrong hands it
uld be abused. That is stating a truism, really.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Large, just pursuing that
r a moment, I take it that you are suggesting
is as a principle which should apply?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: In the organization of broad-
sting in Canada and that it should operate with a
nimum of regulation. However, I take it that you
e not suggesting that at the present time we have

bstantially exceeded the minimum you have in mind?

MR. LARGE: I would suggest that I don't lieve a person could arbitrarily give you an answer that offhand, but I would suggest the present regu- tions could be carefully reviewed by an independent dy just to make sure there are not too many, and rhaps they are unnecessary, some of them.

MR. COYNE: Just going forward from that -- cidentally, you say:

". . .under similar circumstances as the

"newspapers . . .":

presume you don't mean that literally, because the wspapers have no regulations?

MR. LARGE: It is a desirable objective, ough. As long as we are consistent with meeting r obligations to the public -- I am firmly convinced e public should be protected.

MR. COYNE: By regulation?

MR. LARGE: Yes, in some manner.

MR. COYNE: Turning to a slightly different bject, I take it from remarks in an earlier section your brief that you are in favour of their being national broadcasting service in this country?

MR. LARGE: Yes, I can see no reason why here should not be one -- perhaps two or three tional broadcasting services.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you put it the other y: Not only can you see no reason why there should t be, but can you see a positive reason why there ould be?

MR. LARGE: Oh yes, I think any reasonable erson can see the necessity for a national broadcas- ing service.

MR. COYNE: From what we have seen so far here seem to be, broadly speaking, two possible ways f disseminating this national service: Either the .B.C., or whatever it may be, may erect stations of ts own everywhere in the country in order to bring he service in the various parts of the country, or ney may have stations of their own in some parts nd use the facilities of the private independent tations in other parts to reach the people in those reas. I think the latter type of organization is hat we have at the moment?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you favour the continuance f an arrangement of that kind for the dissemination f national broadcasting, or do you think that the .B.C. should build its own stations for that purpose?

MR. LARGE: Well, primarily, I am not en- irely clear as to the question. The way I would nterpret it is this, that if you have a national roadcasting system it must be as it is at present, ith the C.B.C. having some stations, and using the acilities of private stations in other areas; or, here should be simply a number of C.B.C. stations ight across the country joined together by a network, nd that would be the only national network. If hat is the question, it is hard for me to make an nswer. My answer may be this way, that if there

ere to be a system of stations right across Canada
the C.B.C. joined together by network, then on the
ther hand I would presume that there would also be
ne possibility of private stations being allowed
o form their own network alongside of that, and if
nat were the case then there should be a national
ystem in that way, and on the other hand the private
ations could join together and have an alternative
tional network.

MR. COYNE: Take the matter of television -- nd you will be producing television broadcasts here ery shortly: Are you going to use a substantial nount of C.B.C. programming over your television ation here?

MR. LARGE: It was impossible for us to get license without agreeing to that.

MR. COYNE: Would you have preferred not have received any C.B.C. television broadcasts r use in your station?

MR. LARGE: That is rather a theoretical estion because the laws or regulations laid down sisted we include that in our planning, and how could tell you we would plan if that didn't exist -- couldn't possibly give you an answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, Mr. Large, you must ve looked at the economics of the thing . . .

MR. LARGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: . . .in regard to tele- sion; and you must have in the present proposals rked out some thinking as to the degree to which

ou are going to exercise such options as you have in
ne use of C.B.C. programmes. Suppose, for example,
nere were no C.B.C. programmes at all: Do you
nink you could establish a television station?

MR. LARGE: I can unhesitatingly answer
nat, Mr. Fowler: I have every confidence the pri-
ite broadcasting industry in Canada would found
television service whether there was a C.B.C. or
ot -- honestly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see. These programmes
. Coyne has mentioned supplied by C.B.C.: Is it
our planning that you will use quite a substantial
oportion of that national programme?

MR. LARGE: Yes, due to the nature of the
rangement we have gone through; there will cer-
inly be that.

MR. COYNE: You speak in several places in
ur brief that the private broadcasting industry is
titled to equal stature in Canada with any other
stem that may exist: I take it what you have in
nd is that there should be, whatever the situation
now, two systems? At the moment there are not
o systems because the C.B.C. is certainly not
self an independent system with national coverage,
art from the private stations which broadcast its
ogrammes in those areas where it does not have
s own stations.

MR. LARGE: I think the intent of that
atement is that the private broadcasting industry
a body should have the opportunity to appeal to

separate board.

MR. COYNE: Surely "equal stature" -- and tell me whether you agree or not -- implies equal rights and also equal obligations?

MR. LARGE: Yes, I would agree with that.

MR. COYNE: Now, the C.B.C. at the present time, whether it is desirable or not, is charged with the specific obligation of providing a national broadcasting service which, of course, the private stations are not charged with. Do you think, if they are to have equal stature, that they should likewise be charged with an obligation of that or a similar nature by statute?

MR. LARGE: Yes, if we are given subsidization in the same ratio as the C.B.C. are given it by the Government. It is logical that the present system takes part in commercial broadcasting, and they do get a subsidization; I suppose it is in ratio to their commercial income. If the private broadcasters were given a similar subsidization, if they felt they wanted it, then it would seem logical we should be able to carry on some educational and cultural programmes on the same lines as the national system does.

(Page 3615 follows)

MR. COYNE: What would be the advantage from the point of view of the taxpayers who have to provide this subsidization of subsidizing two systems rather than one?

MR. LARGE: Well, I cannot see offhand what dvantage there would be to it but on the other hand t would eliminate this criticism that the private tations are not going ahead and furnishing these rogrammes of an educational and cultural nature that ore people want us to. The present system requires s to be money-minded, but if it was deemed advisable or us to have a subsidy, then we could indulge in hese things.

THE CHAIRMAN: You used the phrase "private roadcasting industry"; you also used the phrase "the rivate broadcasting system"?

MR. LARGE: Well, that is a misuse of the ord, it is not in existence.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask you if here was a private broadcasting industry today?

MR. LARGE: Well, let me answer it in his way: In thirty-four years there have been oughly 137 radio stations founded in Canada, and I elieve 25 private television stations. There is total capital investment of $44 million; there is out 25,000 people directly or indirectly involved broadcasting in Canada. I really believe that an industry and can be recognized as a sizable ortion of the Canadian economy.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know how this

xample will pan out when I get through here, but here have been a lot of branch banks start up in anada; a lot of the people are employed by the branch anks, but I think you would have difficulty in proving hat there was a private individual banking industry n Canada. They are part of a larger system.

MR. LARGE: Well, in Canada I suppose this nterpretation of a private broadcasting system came p because the way it operates, we do have Government- perated stations and the word "private" came up ecause they are owned by private individuals.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the concept has een put to us, and I want to know whether you feel nything meritorious in it, I think the word has been sed that we have what amounts to a system of broad- asting in Canada which has been described sometimes s a partnership between public ownership and private wnership. Now, does the concept of a single broad- asting system -- would you agree that there is a ingle system today?

MR. LARGE: At the present time a single ystem -- I presume you mean in the manner of a etwork, as it were?

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean that you do not have, ou cannot really logically today talk about the rivate broadcasting industry and the public broad- asting industry; you have to talk about the Canadian roadcasting industry, that is the way the case is ut?

MRS. ROGERS: May I say a word? A

artnership would involve equal rights and equal
rivileges, would it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily.

MRS. ROGERS: A partnership to be a partner-
ip, as I have it, if people are partners in business
would think at least there would be a basis of
quality. We are not tax-free in the private indus-
y.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart is remarking that
business it is a very familiar concept to have
rtners with different ownership rights and different
ties and different activities in the overall picture.

MRS. ROGERS: But they do, I would think,
joy proportionate rights. We are not tax-free, in
e first place, as our broadcasting system is set
, and we are not -- there are numerous other things
t that is one point I am trying to bring up.

MR. COYNE: Strictly speaking, I do not
ink the C.B.C. is tax-free but it never makes any
ofits out of which to pay taxes.

MRS. ROGERS: That may be a point but our
ofits go back largely into the business.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Large, to try and tie in
is bit of discussion, I take it from your reply to
e Chairman that you would agree, as far as the
esent situation is concerned, the present scheme
things under the Canadian Broadcasting Act, there
a single system in which various units play their
rt?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Now, this Commission is concerned ith specific problems and specific recommendations. an you tell us in specific terms the ways in which ou think this present structure of one system hould be changed?

MR. LARGE: Well, this present system has eveloped over a period of about 20 years and, frankly, would not be the one to say how it could be changed vernight.

MR. COYNE: But is that not what we have o try to discover? Either it should be left the ay it is or it should be changed, and if it is going o be changed it is going to be changed along specific ines.

MR. LARGE: I think the change should be -- here could be a change, but I certainly do not think t could be decided overnight, not the manner in hich it would be achieved. But there must be steps long the road, and I am not saying that the present ype of thing could not still continue to exist.

THE CHAIRMAN: We do not want to press you eyond what you are prepared to say, but as Mr. oyne says, this is our task and while you may be ble to say you cannot say how it could be done over- ight, we are going to have to, and we are here now nd we want all the help we can get. Let me explain o you what it is. I can see that you may not ave worked out a complete blueprint of change, but t should be possible to tell us if you are in favour f change, what your objections are, what you as

he manager of a station want to be able to do under new system that you cannot do today; put it that ay.

MR. LARGE: The only suggestion I could ake would be that the first desirable thing would e the consideration of a separate regulatory board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why?

MR. LARGE: I think that the present inde- endent broadcasting stations, it would at least in rinciple make them feel that they have a little more qual setup to thrash out problems that may exist rom time to time in ordinary everyday business. That ould be my first reaction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, are there any problems hat you have at the moment that are not being thrashed ut to your satisfaction under the present system?

MR. LARGE: Well, in our particular circum- ances here today I could not give you an answer ecause we have so many problems in the formation of television station that I may be keeping you here r two days.

THE CHAIRMAN: My point is this: If, in tablishing your television station, you are finding adequacy of attention, improper action by the C.B.C., would like to find out about it. If, on the her hand, you are merely saying there is nothing ecific at all, that you want nothing specific at l that you wish to achieve but it is just a matter principle, you feel or would feel better if you d an independent regulatory board?

MR. LARGE: It seems to me it is the principle that is involved more than some specific thing at the moment.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is just a principle and a purely theoretical principle to make you feel better about it, to use your phrase -- I put the same question to you as I put to many other people -- do you think you are entitled to ask the people of Canada to spend $75,000 or $100,000 a year to make you feel better?

MR. LARGE: Well, we feel following the traditions of a democratic Government there must be some slight rearrangement of the present system.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are getting on dangerous ground talking to me about the principle of democratic government, because I wish someone would tell me what part of the democratic system is being broken. Democracy is a system of co-operation in which the will of the people is reflected in legislation, either directly or indirectly, through their elected representatives. The Canadian Broadcasting Act was passed by legislation, it has been there for twenty years and has not been changed much. You may not like it, you may argue against it, but as long as it is there it is democracy.

MR. LARGE: I wonder if I could suggest in connection with that line of thinking that it may be very interesting for the Commission to make an effort to try and find out through some form of independent survey what the ordinary man on the street

eally thinks. I realize that is putting a very ifficult problem to you, but sometimes I feel that we ho are appearing before the Commission are a group f special pleaders, and the man on the street is ot being heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have had people n front of us who say they are representing 40,000 armers, and another group representing 64,000 abourers, and we had 257,000 Home and School Associa- ion members in Halifax the other day. How do you et at this man on the street, this mythical man on he street?

MR. LARGE: Well, I still feel there is connection there, not all but many people who are ppearing are somewhat in the category of special leaders.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we would welcome any- hing. We are open to hear all the evidence anyone ares to give.

MR. LARGE: Well, would you have any con- idence in perhaps some sort of an independent public urvey by an independent organization just to get he pulse of the people?

THE CHAIRMAN: We will give no judgments s we go along, but we have had various views as o the validity and pattern of surveys. Some eople like them and others do not. At the moment he evidence before us would be somewhat mixed on hat subject.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Large, going down towards

e bottom of page 2 in part III, you say:

"Also we would ask the Commission to

"consider recommending that applications

"for non-Government television stations

"be permitted in all areas of Canada."

is is really, I think, expressing your support of e representation of the CARTB and I am wondering ether, or why, you limit it to non-Government tele- sion stations? In other words, if the single-channel licy is to be abandoned and there are to be second ations in some of these centres, is there any reason y one of the second stations should not be a C.B.C. ation?

MR. LARGE: Well, as an individual tax- per I cannot help but think that if television could expanded without expense to the Canadian taxpayer, at avenue should be explored. That would be my swer to that.

MR. COYNE: But supposing you take a market ke, let us say, Edmonton, which is quite a large wn now and which has a private television station. there is going to be an alternative service ovided in the major centres by means, perhaps, of second network, is there any reason in principle, art from this matter of cost, which is very real, y the C.B.C., in order to ensure adequate pro- sion for their own programming, their national ogramming, should not have the second station, let say in Edmonton?

MR. LARGE: If you are -- excuse me for

nswering indirectly -- I would say the second station
ould be put in there without expense to the tax-
ayers. That perhaps that second station, one of
ne requirements should be that it would carry many
ours of the national system's programming as part
f getting that license if that were the way it had
o be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I take it this recom-
endation, Mr. Large, would at least carry you this
ar: That if the people of, say, Winnipeg and
oronto, are to be given an alternative choice of
elevision stations, public or private, that you
ould extend that also to the right of the citizens of
alifax or Charlottetown to have the same choice?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, of course, raises a
asic question as to whether the economy generally
ill stand to support more than one station?

MR. LARGE: That is so, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: And this may be of great
portance to you, may it not?

MR. LARGE: It could be.

MR. COYNE: Those are all my questions,
. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have given
few examples here, Mr. Large, about the manner
which you have assisted local organizations, and
ere is quite an impressive list of these organi-
tions. Have you any idea of the cost per annum
the station in giving those, first of all, the

ost in time which may have been used for commercial
urposes and, secondly, out-of-pocket expenses?

MR. LARGE: It would be very hard to answer
nat because actually this list is incomplete. For
ne past five or six years I have taken it upon myself
o keep a diary at the end of each month of the
ublic service operations of the station.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You have never tried
o cost it?

MR. LARGE: No, for the simple reason we
ve to add several people to our staff to arrive at
true figure. In general I believe many of the
rivate stations are so busy looking after their or-
nary activities, when they get to the public services
ey will carry out the public service but not be
le to report the full extent of their activities.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You do not feel you
uld make a reasonable estimate now?

MR. LARGE: I think we could if you gave
a few days. In this list here we would have
st of the details available. It may be rather a
ngthy job. Let me give you one example of how
is would take place: We had a blood donor clinic
Charlottetown early in May and the clinic was
tting along fairly well, but during the last even-
g they were falling short of donors and we simply
ld our announcer on duty to plug the blood donor
inic as often as possible. Well, we know just
om listening that after every two or three minutes
mentioned the blood donor clinic, that they wanted

donors and it was closing. We do not know how many times he said that over a period of two or three hours, but the net result in this particular instance was they got enough donors and the net result was they decided they only needed one clinic a year in Charlottetown as a result of this effort. It would be very hard for me to give you an honest opinion of the value of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or even of the physical time actually because it was rather an unchartable sort of result?

MR. LARGE: That is right, and many of these things that take place are of this nature.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a few questions. I would like to go back to this subject of regulation because it really is most important to get as much help on this as we can. I was interested, in the first place, to find that the C.B.C. regulations start out -- and I must use your phrase -- they say the regulations provide for only some minimum standards in broadcasting, which shows at least in objective they are apparently looking to the same thing that you are at the beginning of part III; but without having to look at it, I was wondering if I could ask you your views about certain kinds of regulations? The first regulation is the requirement of maintaining the programme law, there could be -- there is no objection to that or could be none. Then, the next one is a very general one of broadcasting which may be redundant, but it says that no station

hall broadcast anything contrary to law, anything indecent, etcetera; there could be no objection to that, could there?

MR. LARGE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, there is a section on political broadcasts, which is mainly based on the statutes; have you any comments on that?

MR. LARGE: The only comment I could make is, during or close to elections we have had requests that a candidate may be allowed to broadcast during the 48-hour period preceeding. Other forms of publication are able to be used by candidates in elections right up to the last minute and for some reason so far the broadcasting industry has been set aside and cannot be used.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, that is in the Act itself and you would need a change in the Act, not the regulations, to change that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We could, of course, recommend it. Have you any idea -- we can find it out elsewhere -- what the basis of that rule is?

MR. LARGE: I have often wondered myself why it is there. There does not seem to be any special reason I can think of.

THE CHAIRMAN: A peaceful time for reflection, perhaps?

MR. LARGE: That is desirable, of course, but there is no reason why one form of publication should be penalized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stewart suggests that

here are limited channels and limited hours and the alue of the last fellows on a political broadcast ay be very great.

MR. LARGE: I might say that that problem till exists, whether it is 48 hours ahead or 24 hours. e still have the same problem because it is not at ll uncommon for a political party the minute a ampaign is announced to phone up and say, "We want ne last available 48 hours during the election".

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a cooling-off eriod before the vote, so to speak. Then, the next as to do with advertising content, specifying certain imits on advertising content. From your experience a broadcaster do you think that some such limitation a proper thing for regulation?

MR. LARGE: I think this answer would de- nd on the personality of the person giving the swer, but I would feel that there should be some mitation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from the statute, I ke it you would feel as a responsible broadcaster, ether it was by regulation or by your will, there ght to be some limitation on it?

MR. LARGE: As a responsible broadcaster would not allow excessive commercialism during y particular period.

THE CHAIRMAN: But is that not an advan- ge to you to have that in in case somebody else mes along who has not got the same feeling?

MR. LARGE: You mean someone coming to us

wanting us to do something?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, some other competitor starting up. Let us say there was no regulation of advertising content at all; the competitor might start up and advertise all the time.

MR. LARGE: We would be quite happy if he did that because listeners would get tired listening to his station.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may work out that way, but from your point of view you feel there is some advantage in having some rules of the game as far as advertising content?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then there is another regulation having to do with food and liquors and drugs and then about reserve time. Any corporation going to have a national system must put some regulation on reserve time?

MR. LARGE: Yes, regardless of what network you are associated with you would be faced with that problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, on this picking up and re-broadcasting, is there any comment on that?

MR. LARGE: Well, it is a facility that is not used very often.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is open to consent in writing if you wish it?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I assume if you are going to have some network control you are going to

ave some control of pick-up and re-broadcast?

MR. LARGE: Yes, it would appear there is ome connection there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not want to take too ong. There is another section here on reproduced rogrammes; is there any experience on that that you ave?

MR. LARGE: The only comment I would make n reproduced programmes is, at the present time the uality of reproduction on a reproduced programme is ich that even the most experienced observer would ot be able to tell the difference. In other words, seems to be rather an antiquated rule because the tate of the art is such now that the programme can e reproduced and you cannot tell the difference.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is true, is it not, hat there have been other regulations in the past hat have been the subject of discussion within the verall broadcasting industry, and there have been hanges made from time to time?

MR. LARGE: Yes, there have been. I as thinking of the price regulation and it seems to e that the broadcasting industry there fairly well howed that it used its common sense when that was orrected.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to go back to he early part where you are talking about the stablishment of the station at Sackville at page , where you say:

"It will be appreciated that apparently

"a great number of years' effort in
"building up an audience was in vain
"when these programmes and features
"were arbitrarily removed to the
"50,000 watt station at Sackville,
"New Brunswick."

s it your belief that the station, the 50,000 watt
:ation at Sackville, should not have been built by
ıe C.B.C.?

MR. LARGE: Certainly not, no, I have no
)jection to it being there at all. I just feel
ıat the programmes that were being fed to this par-
.cular station perhaps should have been left as
ıey were and the Sackville station programmed in some
.her manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in fact, it worked
t that you went to the Dominion network rather than
e Trans-Canada?

MR. LARGE: Exactly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you give us as an ex-
rienced broadcaster what you conceive is a desir-
le future of the Dominion network? We have had
rying views on it; some people have suggested it was
its way out, others say it should be strengthened.
an individual member of that Dominion network
ich way would you like to see it develop, or would
ı advise its development?

MR. LARGE: My own personal reaction to
ıt would be that under the present system Canada
ıld be better off having just one good national

etwork being fed to basic stations, rather than rying to keep two going, one that is not very healthy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you specifically, rom your own, if you like, selfish point of view, ould it be a serious thing for you if the Dominion etwork service was discontinued?

MR. LARGE: From a financial viewpoint it ould not be, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is, even taking into ccount the necessary replacements of these programmes nich you now get and the cost of so replacing?

MR. LARGE: The experience of this station, f course, it has been part of the national network ystem ever since the national network was originated, nd much of our thinking is based on being a network utlet; but that certainly is not to suggest that we ould not find our own way around if we had to.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no doubt, but I was ndering if you attempt to find your own way around uld it be costly or not?

MR. LARGE: It would certainly increase our sts. At the present time we are carrying about ree hours of network a day and broadcasting about urteen hours a day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, in some way you would ve to replace three hours of programming at what-er that would cost?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Some people in the st have suggested to us that the C.B.C. have not

een sufficiently aggressive in their operation of he Dominion network and that, rather than abandon hat network, it should be increased and should be uch more aggressively operated. Have you any houghts on that?

MR. LARGE: If the network is to continue o exist, I would certainly support that. Its operaion should be aggressively pursued and more efforts ade to make it into a real operating network.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have just a couple more ubjects to mention to you. I was, as I think we all ere, impressed by the list of public service activiies which you say is not complete. I do not think here is any doubt in the local sphere the private tation which you speak for has done a good deal, and o you also at all conceive the possibility that there s a national function to be achieved by the private cation? Now, obviously the first answer is that ou cannot achieve national function in the sense f network because that is not there, but I put it to her broadcasters as to where there is a function hich the private station can do in the way of interetation, Canadian history, different local attitudes nterpreted to your audience from other places?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there this function, a lid function for private operators?

MR. LARGE: You mean could there be one, or there one?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, both.

MR. LARGE: I could not give you a specific instance of that, but there have been programme exchanges from station to station across the country at various times. I do not have one in mind at the present time, but there is no reason why it could not be.

(Page 3634 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: Really what I am raising is whether or not, as a man experienced in the private broadcasting field, the emphasis on community service, with no minimization of its values, may not obscure this other function of some actual participation in national values as well?

MR. LARGE: Of course, I think the way the individual station looks at this is that they feel that other stations across the country are performing this similar service -- if that is what you are getting at.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am really thinking of the possibility of a private station, notwithstanding its good community service, making a positive contribution in terms of national values, in terms of interpreting different parts of Canada to your listeners?

MR. LARGE: Yes.

MRS. ROGERS: Are we not doing that now? The Red Cross is national in scope.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that is supporting the local efforts of the Red Cross.

MRS. ROGERS: Yes, but then it is contributing to the national effort.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but it is not the interpretation of national aims and objectives -- it is international, really.

MRS.ROGERS: It is international.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But as I understand the Chairman, it is an interpretation to the people

of Prince Edward Island of the economy of British Columbia, or some such thing as that, leading towards greater national unity; getting the people of each region of the country to understand the others a bit better than they do today.

MRS. ROGERS: We put on interviews with all people who come here from various places when the opportunity presents itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: The sort of thing I am thinking of, frankly, is that we have had many people try to contend that the local radio station is similar to a local newspaper in many respects. You pick up the local newspaper and it does not just confine itself to news; you will find considerable discussion of events and attitudes and points of view from other parts of Canada, and indeed the world; not just news items, but interpretive articles of one kind or another. I am just raising whether it is a fact today, or if it ought to be a fact, that the activities of the private station are not necessarily confined to the community service type of thing, which is important, just as the local newspaper community service is important.

MR. LARGE: We do have two or three instances not only in our news broadcasts -- we have a very good percentage of national news; we have perhaps a little higher percentage of that than perhaps a smaller station would. We reach a broader territory and our news coverage is on a broader basis. In a second instance, as a member station

f the CARTB, we have the "Report from Parliament Hill", nd various press reporters do interpret the Ottawa cene from time to time, and in our television operation I think it is going to be possible to show people n this part of Canada what is happening in other arts much easier. In television there seems to e more of the material you are thinking of available - films showing development of industry, and what s happening in British Columbia, in the tourist ndustry. We are going to use a lot of that material.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one other subject to ask you about and that is something we have sked every witness, I think. You are manager of he station CFCY: Can you tell me if you do feel, nd if so in what respect, that you compete with he C.B.C.?

MR. LARGE: We certainly compete with them or audience, and I suppose for business in some nstances.

THE CHAIRMAN: As far as competition for udience is concerned, that is a rather specialized se of the word "competition", but how about competing for business?

MR. LARGE: It is not an uncommon happening, and perhaps we should not label the C.B.C. as eing the only network in existence that would compete with individual stations for business. A etwork in Canada under any other name, I think, ould compete with the individual station for busiess. The possibility of audience competition, of

course, is carrying on all the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Going back to this business competition with C.B.C. -- just stick to your radio station for the moment because you have not had experience in television yet -- it is true the C.B.C. does not compete with you for local advertising?

MR. LARGE: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Obviously you cannot compete with the C.B.C. for network advertising because you have not got a network. In what sense are you competing for the advertising business?

MR. LARGE: It could happen in this way: there may be a specific programme being placed on so many private stations in an area or across Canada, and for some reason or other the network can schedule that programme on its network at a lower cost -- I suppose because costs can be broken down easier across the country on one whole basis -- and it is possible for a network to offer an advertiser a scheduling of that programme at a lower cost than he could buy a whole series of individual stations across the country for, and in that way they are definitely competing for business.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is that if you had the X Y Z Soap Company with $10,000 to spend they might choose to buy the network package deal rather than buy a whole series of individual things with that $10,000?

MR. LARGE: Yes, and I would like to emphasize again I don't think we should label the C.B.C.

is the only network who would do that. It happens in the United States too.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that is not really the sort of simple kind of competitive collision that you get when you speak of competition between two grocery stores?

MR. LARGE: It gets down to a pretty good fundamental when you suddenly find a programme that you have had disappearing and your income drops that much because it has gone to the network, whatever network it may be.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am only asking these questions because we are most anxious to get clear what is meant by competition between the C.B.C. and private stations.

MR. LARGE: I think that is probably the best example you can get. It is a recurring event; it happens once in awhile.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may have to estimate a little on this, but when you get into television, at least under the present system, there would be no opportunity then for this kind of competition, would there?

MR. LARGE: Oh yes, there could be, just as easily in television as in radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Except that presumably if it is sold to the C.B.C. you would be on the network?

MR. LARGE: Yes, but as a network station, because of the way network rates are handled, we probably would get paid less for carrying that

rogramme as a network station than as an individual tation. There are a series of discounts.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: May I come back to his question of regulations governing political roadcasts which seem to bother you. You say you on't see the reasoning behind this regulation anning broadcasts 48 hours before. I don't have ny answer either, but I wonder if you might agree ith this interpretation: Would you not think this egulation is trying to prevent last-minute slander n the air? Even if it is not slander, let us say t is just a damaging statement unsupported by facts ade at the last minute without giving the opponent chance to reply. You may say, well, the same thing appens; if there is a limit of 48 hours he could till make it, but there is still that 48 hours where e could reply, say, through the press or public eetings or by sending circular letters to the voters, r even in the press by having the two opposite tatements by readers or candidates. It is, in fact, robably a tribute to the printed word which is far ore potent than the spoken word.

MR. LARGE: Should not the person concerned lave the same opportunity of replying over the broad-asting station as the person making the statement?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Well, there is lways the last minute -- five minutes to 12.00, or omething like that.

MR. LARGE: Well, one candidate may place lis ad in the press and the other may not realize

hat was happening until he reads it.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: If there was a damaging statement made the night before, he can always reply in the press or through a statement to a reporter, but he can't do it on the air. There is always a last minute for someone. That may be the reason, I don't know.

MR. LARGE: He could still do it over the roadcasting station if the regulations were not as hey exist.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Who will get the ast minute?

MR. LARGE: Who will get the last page n the last issue of the newspaper?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But it is the same ssue, so two can be heard at the same time in the wspaper, but not on the air.

MR. LARGE: Yes, I follow your reasoning here, but it would be better perhaps -- the same inciple is going to exist as to stages whether it 48 hours or one minute.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But only one person can speak on the one channel.

MR. LARGE: But in this particular area u can hear at least a dozen broadcasting stations.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Well, I don't ow the explanation, myself, but that may be it.

MR. LARGE: I know if I were a politician this area and I couldn't get on a station, there e a number of other stations I could get on.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But the time may ave been purchased by someone. The political party ith the most money may have bought that time. It is one in some provinces; they buy the last time they an get, and the other party doesn't have the money, nd there is always somebody who gets the last word hat way, and that may be the reason for the regulation, I don't know. Perhaps you could think that over.

MR. LARGE: I don't think it is open to n easy answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: We want to thank you all for bringing this brief to us and preparing it and presenting it so well. It is perfectly clear to you we were interested in it by the scope of our questioning.

MR. LARGE: If there is anything else we can supply, Mr. Fowler, please let me know.

SUBMISSION OF THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE.

PPEARANCE:

Mr. J.L. Dewar.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is the rince Edward Island Federation of Agriculture. The mes I have are Mr. A.M. Johnstone, President, and . J.L. Dewar, Secretary.

MR. DEWAR: Mr. Johnstone is not with me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. We will start marking your brief as Exhibit No. 144.

HIBIT NO. 144: Brief of The Prince Edward Island Federation of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may either read the ief or summarize it as you choose.

MR. DEWAR : As the brief is not very lengthy, d I wasn't prepared to summarize it, I think I uld prefer to read it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just as you wish.

MR. DEWAR: Chairman and members, Royal mmission on Radio and Television Broadcasting.

Gentlemen: The Prince Edward Island Federion of Agriculture welcomes and appreciates the portunity of appearing before this Commission. r organization recognizes the fact that radio has ayed an important and significant part in the delopment of national attitudes and in cultural and ucational progress. While few of the rural ople in this province have yet been exposed to

levision, nevertheless it is fully realized that levision may well have an impact upon the social, ltural and educational life of people only exceeded that of the development of printing during the ddle ages.

In a country as vast as Canada with a ral population scattered over thousands of miles, is highly important that the whole question of dio and television be approached and dealt with om a national standpoint. While it may be possible r private enterprise to provide wealthy and popu- us urban centers with very satisfactory radio and T.V. rvice, we believe that the rural population would provided with a bare minimum of service were not e resources of the nation marshalled in a system ich is in a position to provide uniform service om West to East.

Our organization does not suggest that per- tion has been attained under the present system we do believe that under a system which brings h public stations and private stations into one tem with direction and control by a Board of ernors responsible to Parliament, that the radio television interests of the Canadian public can protected and advanced.

We see an important field for private io stations operating within the framework of a ional system; in this province the farm people e available to them both the facilities of the .C. stations and of radio station CFCY, operated

y The Island Radio Broadcasting Company and those
f CJRW, operated by The Gulf Broadcasting Company.
ne two latter companies have made and are continuing
o make an important and commendable contribution to
ne life of this province in public-spirited service
f a high order. We suggest that a radio system
nich permits these companies to operate as a sound
usiness proposition is a desirable one, and further
uggest that national policies should be designed to
rovide a favourable medium of growth for private
ations which can serve the local interests of any
rticular area.

Education: Generally the rural Canadian
mmunity and more particularly such communities
this province are facing very complex educational
oblems. Both radio and T.V. entering as they do
timately into family home life, are of extreme
ucational significance. The development of school
ogrammes on a regional basis in the Maritimes
ggests the possibility of similar programmes being
veloped nationally. In addition to school
ogrammes, Canadian radio has been assisting in
oviding a variety of educational programmes for
ults, among which might be mentioned Farm Radio
rum and Citizens' Forum. While the Government of
nada has been unwilling to intervene in educational
tters of a formal and academic nature, we believe
at there is, in the field of radio and T.V., an
cellent opportunity for general education on a
tional basis. For this reason we are of the

pinion that nothing should be done which will in
ay way weaken or undermine the national character
radio and television in this country. We suggest
hat increased emphasis can, with advantage, be
laced on the educational possibilities of broadcasting.
his can be of great importance, particularly in
ural areas where distance and other limitations deny
he population access to many of the educational and
ultural features common in urban society.

Financing: Our organization does not
laim to be an authority on the detailed financing
broadcasting, but does realize that both forms of
oadcasting entail heavy expenditures, and in the
se of television amounts which can only be provided
tisfactorily in a public way. Radio and T.V. broad-
sting and facilities must be paid for by the
nadian people and we do not believe that the users
ould be led to believe that there is any painless
thod of such financing. While advertising revenues
y shift the load from one section of the population
another, yet the money still comes from the one
urce. For this reason we suggest that this Com-
ssion should not be hesitant in recommending that
e Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be provided with
ple funds for carrying out its work, and given
surances for reasonable advance periods that such
nds will be available in order that radio and
levision may be planned on a long-term basis
ther than from year to year as now appears to be
e case. While advertising may be a useful medium

in changing the rate and direction of the flow of oney, we submit that it does not create wealth in ny marked degree, and that in the long run taxation an more equitably spread the load of radio and T.V. osts.

Separate Regulatory Body: Organized anadian agriculture takes the stand that we have n Canada one national system of broadcasting, a ystem in which public and private stations operate nder the direction of a Board of Governors respon- ible to Parliament. We are aware that a demand has een put forward by private stations for a separate egulatory body, and while the powers and functions f such a body have not been clearly defined, we are oncerned that such a development might mean the eparation of Canadian broadcasting, both in theory nd practice, into two systems which would result in nproductive competition and a possible lessening of he usefulness of the present component parts of anadian broadcasting.

National networks are an extremely valuable nd important feature of Canadian broadcasting, and hile private stations may from time to time estab- ish networks on a regional basis, we doubt that it ould be possible for them to provide national net- orks on the scale and in as satisfactory a manner s is now the case.

In taking this attitude with respect to separate regulatory body we do not in any way inimize the contribution and the importance of the

·ivate stations. We recognize that private stations ·ovide a service which cannot be provided by nation-·ly-owned broadcasting stations alone; this is ·rticularly true in the field of community service. ·en with the large number of private stations ·esently licensed, their operation appears to have ·oven economically rewarding, and the same sort of ·ndition should occur in television over the years.

Aims and Objectives: In seeking a yard-·ick to measure the conflicting claims and opinions ·th respect to radio and television coverage and ·ogrammes in Canada it should, in our opinion, be ·pt in mind that the important consideration is the ·lfare of the Canadian people. This welfare should ·all times take precedence over that of either the ·oadcasting Corporation or of the private stations. ·ganized Canadian agriculture supports the present ·stem of radio in Canada as a means of providing:

(a) Adequate coverage for all parts of the country and for all sections of the population.

(b) Opportunity for the development of Canadian talent and the interpretation of the Canadian way of life.

(c) Resistance to the domination of Canadian culture by a pattern established in the United States.

Farm people have through the present system ·radio been provided with services of considerable ·ue and services which are generally appreciated --

or example, the broadcasting of weather information, ith attention being paid to the peculiar needs of he farming industry in different regions. The pro- ision of farm market information on a daily basis s a service listened to attentively by large numbers f farm people. In addition, special programmes overing a wide variety of agricultural topics and roblems enable farm people to keep informed. The evelopment of National Farm Radio Forum has, over a eriod of sixteen years, done much to bring together arm people for study, not only on a community basis it on a national basis as well. Without the present ational character of radio in Canada such a programme ould not be possible, and it is one which has tracted international attention and has been the bject of study and report by UNESCO.

Conclusion: To a greater extent than is rhaps the case with the urban population, farm ople are dependent upon radio, and, in the future, T.V. for information, education and entertainment. ral isolation and the rigours of the Canadian winter nfine the farm family for much of the time to the rm home. Our organization feels that the continua- on of programmes and services of special interest d of special value to farm people is highly desir- le, and will require, in television, extension of e services now being provided by radio.

The Prince Edward Island Federation of riculture is made up of sixteen member organizations ich in themselves represent, directly or indirectly,

very large percentage of our farm people. In addition, the Federation is supported by the direct membership of a large number of individual farmers. In this submission we have endeavoured to state what we consider to be the general opinion of our rural people and, in particular, of that section of rural people who are most actively concerned with the provision of educational and cultural programmes designed to improve and make more interesting farm life. The views set out in this brief are, we believe, generally supported by farm organizations and their consideration by this Commission will be much appreciated by rural Canada.

For the privilege and courtesy of this hearing, we again express our thanks and appreciation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dewar.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Mr. Dewar, in the last paragraph of your brief you outline in general terms the membership of the Federation and the number of organizations; could you give us more particulars about the number of members that you have within the Federation?

MR. DEWAR: Our organization is at once a Federation and it also has the form of a union. It is a Federation due to the fact we have sixteen other organizations affiliated with it. It has the form of a union due to the fact we have individual farmer members as well. To reply to your question as to the total membership: For instance, we have in this province roughly somewhere between 8,000 and 10,000

ommercial farmers. Every producer of milk and cream
n this Province is a member of the Dairymen's Associa-
ion, and the Dairymen's Association is a member of
he Federation of Agriculture. The Co-operative
nion is a member of the Federation of Agriculture,
nd it has 5,000 members in this Province. There is
a great deal of duplication in that membership. Fee-
aying individual farmer members are in the vicinity
f 2,500.

MR. de GRANDPRE: How was this brief prepared?
as it prepared by the Executive Committee of the Federa-
ion and then approved by a general meeting of the
ederation, or was it discussed at a general meeting
f the Federation and then set down or put down in a
rief form?

MR. DEWAR: The decision to present a brief
o this Commission was first made at the meeting of
ur Board of Directors some three months ago, and the
uestion was discussed, the various aspects and the
erms of reference of the Commission, and the Secre-
ary was instructed to prepare a brief which was then
eviewed at a subsequent meeting by the Board of Direc-
ors and approved.

MR. de GRANDPRE: And has the Federation
repared or presented a similar brief before other
ommissions?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, we presented a brief to
he Gordon Commission last year.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Did you prepare a brief
or the Massey Commission?

MR. DEWAR: I believe we did. I wasn't with the organization at that time, and I am not in a position to answer yes or no.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Could you tell us if the brief presented before, in general terms, was similar to the brief you are now presenting before this Commission?

MR. DEWAR: That is, the brief to the Massey Commission or to the Gordon Commission?

MR. de GRANDPRE: The Gordon Commission, because that is the only one you are sure of.

MR. DEWAR: Well, this would probably be on different subjects.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, I would like to know.

MR. DEWAR: It was prepared in a similar manner but, of course, it dealt with a very much different topic. It was confined almost entirely to the agricultural life and problems and prospects of this Province.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the purpose of Mr. de Grandpre's question is this, that the brief, of course, has to stand on its own feet as it is now presented, but if the present attitude reflected in the brief of your organization is the same attitude that was reflected in previous briefs on radio, then in addition to the approval of the Board of Directors there is apparently the approval, by silence, if you like, of your entire membership for not having protested against similar statements in the past. That, I think, is the purpose.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is what I wanted to
ow, if there was approval of the brief by individual
mbers?

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean by ---

MR. DEWAR: Well, first of all, I cannot say
s or no, whether or not there was a brief presented
the Massey Commission -- there was not, I see -- I
s not present at that time.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That was the only purpose
my question on this point. Now, could you tell us
the Island receives good or excellent coverage from
e radio stations? Do you receive complaints from
ur members as to the extent of coverage?

MR. DEWAR: Generally I would say that the
verage is very satisfactory, because as Mr. Large
ntioned earlier in his evidence, there are quite a
mber of stations which can be reached. But, for
stance, I must say the reception in the Eastern end
the Province from CBA has not been too satisfactory;
ither has the reception from CJRW in Summerside
st of Charlottetown; CFCY reception, I think, is
nerally satisfactory over the entire Province. It
y be possible that in the vicinity of Summerside
ception from CJRW could be a little superior, I do
know. Certainly the western end of the Province
ll have a better reception from CBA Sackville than
e eastern end of the Province, but there is no part
the Province that is suffering from lack of cover-
e and there is certainly a variety of choice too.
instance, we get New Carlisle, particularly the

tation at Antigonish, Sydney and Halifax.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, all parts of the rovince are covered by one group of stations or an ndividual station?

MR. DEWAR: That is true.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, you indicate on page of your brief in the second paragraph:

"In a country as vast as Canada with a "rural population scattered over "thousands of miles, it is highly im- "portant that the whole question of "radio and television be approached "and dealt with from a national stand- "point."

take it that this is also reflected in paragraph (a) your aims and objections at page 4 of your brief:

"Adequate coverage for all parts of the "country and for all sections of the "population".

uld you tell us whether you are referring to adequate verage in terms of actual physical coverage, or in rms of enlightened programmes?

MR. DEWAR: More particularly the latter. I may be permitted to elaborate on that: to some tent organized Canadian agriculture feels that it very important that the farmers of British Columbia d the Prairies and all the Maritime Provinces become, far as possible, acquainted with the different nditions and the different problems that exist in country as wide as this. We feel that the present

stem of radio in Canada has performed a rather valu-
le service in interpreting one section of Canadian
riculture to the other sections, both geographically
d from a commodity standpoint as well.

MR. de GRANDPRE: The farm programmes that
u receive from C.B.C., are they broadcast every
y or only once or twice a week?

MR. DEWAR: Well, certainly what is known as
e Farm Broadcast, that is the noonday broadcast
rried by C.B.C. stations, is one of the oldest pro-
ammes that we have in Canadian radio, and it is a
ily programmes with the exception of ---

MR. de GRANDPRE: The National Farm Broad-
st is received through the C.B.C. every noon?

MR. DEWAR: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you also receive a
rm broadcast from the private stations in this area?

MR. DEWAR: It may perhaps be fairer to
k that question of Mr. Large. I may be subject to
rrection here, but to my knowledge the private
ations do not have a regular scheduled system of
rm broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: They may deal from time to
me with farm problems?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, from time to time, upon
quest, and certainly I would like to say that both
e private stations in this Province are most co-
erative in providing that type of service to farm
ople.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are talking of the

.B.C. programme which is a regular market report, dis-
ussion of farm problems, etcetera, five days a week,
eek in and week out?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, and in addition there is
he weekly programme during the winter months of the
ational Farm Radio Forum, which completed its
ixteenth season in the latter part of March. Now,
hat is a study group programme, it brings rural people
ogether in their homes, in kitchen meetings, but in
ddition it gets people across the entire country listen-
ng to the same broadcast, studying the same subject
r material and then reporting their views back and
orth. I would like to pay particular tribute to
arm Radio Forum as being, I think, a very valuable
orm of education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you develop that, Mr.
e Grandpre?

MR. de GRANDPRE: That was my next question.
s it stands today, therefore, you have a National
arm Broadcast which ties Canadian farmers together
nd discusses Canadian farm problems?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, on a social and economic
asis.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But as far as Prince
dward Island is concerned, you have no farm programme
hich would discuss local or regional farm problems?

MR. DEWAR: Perhaps throughout the year --
I may need some additional information on this --
CY is carrying for the women's institutes of the
rovince a regular broadcast, a regular weekly broadcast.

w, certainly the women's institutes are primarily a
ral organization; I am not a very good authority on
e programmes of the private station and perhaps Mr.
rge might help us out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Large, could you help
on this?

MRS. LARGE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to
ing to the attention of the people present that we
carry the junior farmers' special broadcast, and
at is on regularly all winter long. We also have
e farm and rural women on every week, 15 minutes on
regular programme the year round if they want to stay
they usually go off in the summer months. We
ve other programmes of a similar nature to farm
ople, we always keep the door open.

MR. de GRANDPRE: What is the general con-
t of the National Farm Broadcast which comes on every
at noon?

MR. DEWAR: That is on a regional basis,
have a Maritime Farm Broadcast which originates in
ifax. These market broadcasts are not on a
ional basis, they could not be because in the East
y would concern themselves with the price of live-
ck, vegetables and so on, and in the West it is
in.

THE CHAIRMAN: The West is not interested
the price of lobsters, are they?

MR. DEWAR: Not very much, only when they
them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So to that extent the

rmers of the Maritimes receive a farm programme which
directed to their problems and trying to offer
lutions to their various problems and questions?

MR. DEWAR: That is true.

MR. de GRANDPRE: To that extent?

MR. DEWAR: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, a little further down
your brief you indicate:

"While the Government of Canada has been
"unwilling to intervene in educational
"matters -- "

I think in order to put the record straight we should
y that educational problems are of the Provincial
risdiction and it is not a matter of being unwilling
, but being unable to.

MR. DEWAR: We are painfully aware of that.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, the development of
hool programmes on a regional basis in the Maritimes
ggests a possibility of similar programmes being
veloped nationally. Do I take from this sentence,
. Dewar, that you do not receive the Friday School
oadcast which is produced by the various Departments
Education and the C.B.C. and which is broadcast on
national basis on Friday afternoons? I am sorry,
t I cannot give you the exact time.

MR. DEWAR: There again I think I would
ve to call on the assistance of someone who is a
ttle closer. There are a lot of radio programmes
do not hear, particularly as I am in an office all
y, and there are lots of programmes I do not hear

ıd that I am not acquainted with. The three Mari-
.me Provinces have gotten together and co-operated
ı the development of a school broadcast. Now, I
.s not aware -- in fact, it is my belief that we
.d not have that type of thing being done on a
tional basis, that outside of the Maritimes each
ovince is more or less going it alone so far as
hool broadcasts are concerned.

MR. de GRANDPRE: We have received evidence
fore that the school broadcasts are done on a Pro-
ncial or regional basis on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wed-
sdays and Thursdays, but on Fridays it is done on a
tional basis. I think my statement is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, at least you are not
recting this comment to that particular question,
ether you do or do not receive national Friday pro-
amming?

MR. DEWAR: No; if I may be permitted:
this educational question, in such a province as
is it is definitely one of the "have not" provinces
l it has carried throughout the years a terrific
ad in educating young people who leave the province
l have settled in the New England States, in
stern Canada, and now more particularly in Central
ada where there are more opportunities for employ-
t for them in industry and by Government. The
t of educating our young people out of our Pro-
cial resources is becoming almost, well, it is
intolerable burden as our educational standards
not keeping pace with the more favoured parts of

Canada. There is possibly in both radio and television some hope of dividing that load up a little bit more fairly; that is, if we can get national funds either directly or indirectly for education. That is, so long as the Federal Government refuses to intervene in this Provincial stamping ground, then there may not be too much objection to their using radio and television as perhaps an indirect approach to the educational problem, or as a foot in the door to something further.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, apart from the question of getting national funds, is not your real point that you may get a national service which has educational affiliates to help redress this imbalance which exists that you have just spoken of?

MR. DEWAR: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not asking for funds, you are seeking an educational service?

MR. DEWAR: That is correct.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You indicate in your brief that C.B.C. should put emphasis or more emphasis on the educational programmes and other programmes which will tend to develop Canadianism and a true Canadian unity. It has been suggested to us that this object is a very laudable one, but these programmes are practically a waste of money and nobody listens to them. Do you have any comments to make on that suggestion made to us before?

MR. DEWAR: I have a good bit more faith and confidence in the cultural development of the

Canadian people to accept that statement that no one listens to these programmes. I think people do listen to them; not everyone listens to them, not everyone eats the same food, I might like brown bread and someone else might like white bread, but it would be unfair for me to say that no one ate white bread.

MR. de GRANDPRE: By and large, while discussing this broadcast problem with your members and other representatives of the various associations which form the Federation, did you get the impression that these programmes were actually listened to by the persons with whom you were then talking?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, I did.

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are trying to find out is to test the validity of the general statement, as Mr. de Grandpre says, nobody listens to them. Well, if you can speak of your own knowledge that people do listen to them, to that extent it is an answer.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Coming now to the question of financing, you make the statement in the second sentence on page 3:

"Radio and T.V. broadcasting and facili-
"ties must be paid for by the Canadian
"people and we do not believe that the
"users should be led to believe that
"there is any painless method of such
"financing."

Do you indicate thereby that there should be a license fee, because you refer to the user and I gather the impression that your Association or the Federation

as in favour of a license fee; is that what you had
n mind?

MR. DEWAR: No, that would be an incorrect
nterpretation of it. The idea we are attempting
o convey there is this: that if radio and T.V. costs
n toto $100 million a year in Canada, and that the
anadian people are going to pay that in some way or
ther, either in the way of taxation direct or indirect
r they will pay it in increased costs of goods and
ommodities. In that way there would appear to be
nly three main ways of financing radio and television
n Canada, direct taxation, indirect taxation and
dvertising revenue. Now, we feel that to suggest
o the Canadian people that radio and television can
e provided at no cost to them through advertising
unds, we do not accept that statement and we do not
onsider it is a realistic approach to the problem
f financing. If radio and television is worth any-
ing -- and it is, there is no question about that --
en we see nothing wrong with the Canadian people
nancing it through taxation, preferably indirect
xation which, I suppose, is a painless form of tax-
ion.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Relatively.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But in that manner some
nadians would be paying for radio or television ser-
e without actually receiving the benefit of those
rvices.

MR. DEWAR: There are Canadians that are
ying -- paying for the baby bonus and not receiving

it. I do not think you can have complete equality there.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You feel that this burden, being a national service, that this burden should be carried by all Canadians; that is the intent of your recommendation?

MR. DEWAR: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you have any comments to make on the present excise tax that has been imposed against television sets and parts?

MR. DEWAR: Not specifically. We have excise tax and sales tax on practically everything that we buy; that is the easy form of indirect taxation, and certainly I would see nothing wrong about an excise tax on T.V. sets. At least people having the use of the T.V. sets are the ones to pay the tax on them.

MR. de GRANDPRE: So it is a fair statement to say that your Federation is against the license fee but has no particular objection to the excise tax?

MR. DEWAR: That is true. Certainly license fees which are collected on an individual basis are unsatisfactory, particularly with rural people because rural people particularly in this Province are opposed in principle to a license fee of that kind, and the cost of collecting them, I think, is almost prohibitive.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, referring to the last paragraph on page 3 of the brief you indicate that the establishment of a separate regulatory body -- you say:

"We are aware that a demand has been
"put forward by private stations for
"a separate regulatory body and while
"the powers and functions of such a
"body have not been clearly defined,
"we are concerned that such a de-
"velopment might mean the separation
"of Canadian broadcasting both in
"theory and practice into two systems
"which would result in unproductive
"competition and a possible lessening
"of the usefulness of the present com-
"ponent parts of Canadian broadcasting."

ou are taking a view here which is at the other pole f some of the views we have had expressed, that com- etition is healthy and it would improve the quality f the programmes. Why do you take this attitude that ompetition would lessen, it would result in unproduc- ive competition; what do you mean exactly by these ords?

MR. DEWAR: Well, the thought embodied there s this: Supposing we were to have develop in Canada private system of radio and television broadcasting, nd then the Government system, the C.B.C., and those wo systems spent much of their time or much of their esources clawing at one another for business and or listeners, and in order to attract listeners would et into the field of give-away programmes and that ort of thing. That is what we mean by non-produc- ve competition, because it is not productive of

ny value or good.

MR . de GRANDPRE: Does it not follow in ther trends or fields that when you have competition ou are likely to have a better product on the market?

MR. DEWAR: That is generally so, but I m not always convinced that it is always right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You feel in broadcasting f you have too much competition it is liable to reduce he quality or quantity of the programme?

MR. DEWAR: More the quality because the emptation to provide them with what they want rather han with what perhaps might be better for them, I think ould be rather great.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Now, your Federation is lso against a separate regulatory body. Does your ederation think that it is absolutely essential for he C.B.C. to keep all the powers that it now has in rder to provide Canadians with a national system, r could not some of the powers which it now enjoys be urned over to other departments or other Commissions r corporations -- or call them by whatever name you ant to call them.

MR. DEWAR: Yes, I suppose there is no ractical reason why these powers could not be turned ver to some other body, or perhaps the C.B.C. stripped ompletely of its powers to regulate. But, looking t the thing from a practical standpoint, I think we ll accept the necessity of having some regulatory ody. There must be someone to act as an umpire of he game. Generally speaking, agriculture in Canada

ıkes the system of radio that we have, that means both
ıe C.B.C. and the private stations; we like the system
ıd we have not been convinced by anyone that the
ətting up of a separate independent regulatory body
s going to improve the system, because it has not
een explained to us just what the word "independent"
eans, what it is independent of. Is it going to
e independent of Parliament, independent of the
overnment, independent of the C.B.C.? We have not
een told what "independent" means. We like the
ystem as it is and we see no point in supporting what
ould appear to be rather a radical departure in umpir-
ng the game.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You are rather afraid of
he uncertainty of the future?

MR. DEWAR: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Because you have not been
old what the body would be?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, or what its powers would
e or what it would be or what good it might have.

MR. de GRANDPRE: That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only thing I wanted to
sk you was as to this National Farm Radio Forum that
ou mentioned. We had some evidence, I think in
alifax, that there was quite a widespread practice
f smaller farm groups getting together for discussion
f these various topics that come up on the programme.
oes the same thing happen here in Prince Edward
sland?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, that is true, it happens

every province with the exception of Newfoundland.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, I do not need to cover e same evidence with you that we had before just to sure that the same kind of listening and debate t-up exists in this Province as there?

MR. DEWAR: That is true.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And you have fore- owledge of the subjects that are going to be discussed the various Farm Forums?

MR. DEWAR: Yes, these topics were for the st part agreed on at a national conference held in tario in the first part of June. These topics are own, there are thirteen of them known at least, and addition there have been three or four nights left en for what might be a topic of a current issue. I n recall a hot question, the pipeline, for instance. r the most part the people that are participating in rm Radio Forum suggest topics themselves, and all ld there were eight hundred different topics sugges- d by the farm groups throughout Canada in January. en, the majority favour a given topic and there is process of weeding out until you end up with, roughly, fteen topics.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dewar, very ch. We appreciate the brief and will consider it. have been accused of not having a recess in the lifax sessions in the middle of the morning, so we ll break now for five or ten minutes and resume th the brief of the Board of Trade.

-A short recess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we call this next ief, Mr. Large, you were out of the room at the time, d for the completion of the record Mr. Dewar pre- nted the brief for the Federation of Agriculture and s very frank in saying he spent most of his time the office and he was not able to give a full state- nt as to what was done in the farm broadcast area the private stations. He was talking in particular out the National Farm Forum and also the daily C.B.C. rket and Farm Report which comes on around noon. uld you care to tell us, in order to complete the cord, what your station CFCY does in respect of farm oadcasts?

MR. LARGE: Yes. First of all, to clarify point, we do not carry the daily farm broadcast. wever, we do carry the National Farm Broadcast weekly, d that was re-introduced to our schedule at the quest of the Provincial Federation of Agriculture. was taken off our schedule when we were made a minion network station, and after our Dominion net- rk scheduling became more flexible about a year ago became apparent we would be able to carry it, and ter some discussions with them we carried the Nation- Farm Broadcast, and, by the way, the local Farm rum was following it every week. On a daily basis have a Farm Information programme around 10.00 ch morning Monday through Friday, and at 12.00 noon ery day we have another which gives the weather and vestock prices. I believe other programmes have en mentioned here before. We carry a weekly or a

i-weekly -- alternate weeks -- for the Junior Farmers
ederation, and any other farm group that approaches
s that wishes to get on these programmes is certainly
elcome to come and we will be glad to arrange it.
ur feeling is that we are here in the middle of an
gricultural area, and if there is something useful
e can contribute in that way we will be very glad to
o it.

THE CHAIRMAN: In connection with these two
aily service programmes, are they sponsored?

MR. LARGE: Yes, they are both commercial
rogrammes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the one in the morning,
hat is its general nature?

MR. LARGE: The one in the morning is farm
nformation, interviews with farmers on their particu-
ar problems, and material of that nature. The noon
ne is just the latest livestock prices and weather,
nd also tips for farmers as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: How long are each of these?

MR. LARGE: The one in the morning is
quarter of an hour, and the one at noon is five
inutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That really completes the
ecord.

SUBMISSION OF THE CHARLOTTETOWN BOARD OF TRADE

PEARANCES:

Mr. B. Rogers.

Mr. R.E. Taylor.

Mr. F.W. Hyndman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next brief is that of e Charlottetown Board of Trade, and I understand Mr. gers, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Hyndman are here. Is Mr. udet with you?

MR. ROGERS: He is in the audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who is going to present this ief?

MR. ROGERS: I will.

THE CHAIRMAN: This will be Exhibit No. 145.

HIBIT NO. 145: Brief of the Charlottetown Board of Trade.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed to present e brief?

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the yal Commission on Broadcasting, this has been pre- red by the Charlottetown Board of Trade, and I will w read the brief.

The present and growing decline in the use sound broadcasting indicates a further and pos- bly a rapid acceleration of the decline of sound oadcasting. The consequent reorientation in the dustry suggests caution in future financial commit- nts. The fact that private stations will find it

ecessary to accelerate their write-offs on plant and quipment suggests that C.B.C. should be no less dili-ent in its efforts to lessen, as far as possible, ny further loss of taxpayers' funds in this direction.

It follows that demand for television ser-ice will arise in all areas of Canada, including hose in which it is not economically possible for rivate stations to function.

In line with accepted practice in other fields would seem apparent that such service in the more emote areas should be a Governmental responsibility, ather than in populous districts where competition ong private stations should ensure prompt perfor-nce, as occurs in other industry.

This indicates the necessity of returning the principles of private industry believed in by is Board, and championed continuously by the nadian Chamber of Commerce throughout Canada.

The fact that T.V. transmissions, in the esent state of the art, are more limited in the ea they cover than sound broadcasting, emphasizes e local interest angle of this service. This Board lieves the largest possible use should be made of is factor.

The C.B.C. function would appear to be the pplying of the national interest angle, all of ich suggests the desirability of that organization stricting itself to production and distribution this type of material, and the so-called "sus-ining programmes" of the sound broadcasting era.

If the C.B.C. diverted all the funds the people of Canada could afford to this use, along with supplying uneconomic areas with sound and T.V. service, it would seem a Government service would be carrying out all that could be expected of it.

This Board firmly believes in the private ownership of stations where possible, and has lived for many years in an area so served. Our locally-owned station CFCY, one of the earlier Canadian stations, has served the area well. It further believes no "chain" ownership should be possible for obvious reasons.

The Board does feel, however, that network broadcasting should be possible in the entertainment area, as tending to make possible the supplying of superior Canadian programmes beyond the means of individual stations.

Certain safeguards could and should be set up for the operation of such networks, and the general regulation of all Canadian stations, including those now owned by the C.B.C. and which this Board believes should be transferred to an operating management distinct from the Canadian Broadcasting Commission, whose function should be to deal with the Canadian policy on broadcasting generally and supplying the services specifically referred to in this brief.

This Board therefore recommends:

(a) That the C.B.C., over a period of time, divorce itself from station operation,

except in remote or uneconomic area;

(b) That it provide policy and general regulation to all broadcasting stations;

(c) That it withdraw from competition for advertising, and depend on votes of Parliament, as do other Government services;

(e) That the present organization of the C.B.C. be broken down to provide -

(1) the regulating authority suggested herein;

(2) a separate organization to provide operation in remote and uneconomic areas;

(3) a third Board or Crown Company to provide sustaining and educational programmes, and possibly technical assistance to private stations, as is currently provided by other Departments to the industries with which they are associated.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. dman was in charge of our committee who, with others, prepared this brief, and while he is in vate business he has been keenly interested in io for many years, and will be willing to answer questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rogers.

MR. COYNE: I assume I should direct my stions to you, Mr. Hyndman?

MR. HYNDMAN: If you will.

MR. COYNE: Or any one of you may take part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, don't any one of you esitate to join in.

MR. COYNE: The first point you mention in your brief is the present decline in what you envisage s a future rapid decline in sound broadcasting; do you mean to suggest that the C.B.C. should be cutting down on its radio service?

MR. HYNDMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, that he starting point of our thinking was, is this the ime for radical consideration of the whole broadcas- ing business or not. I came up from the earliest days of broadcasting; I was the first person in Prince Edward Island to broadcast although I have never been connected with it in an economic sense. Our committee discussed this very carefully and brought it before the full meeting of the Board, and this question you raise raised considerable comment at that meeting. It was really to direct our thinking into a certain line, and that is, is this the time to consider change, and I think anybody will admit as they go through any town and see the T.V. antennas going up that they must realize that the actual listening and watching of the public is going to be directed in that channel.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyndman, this is the basic fact you start with, which is that there is a present decline in the use of sound broadcasting, and you suggest a rapid acceleration in the decline of sound broadcasting, and it happens to be directly

ontrary to almost the unanimous opinion we have had
o far in this inquiry.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: From those such as
adio broadcasters themselves who always feel there
ill be a place for radio.

MR. HYNDMAN: We realize that. This was a
eading point of thought. We know we are faced with
he fact that the T.V. antennas are going up, and if
t is going to change the thing we felt your Commission
ould give it consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are saying there is
decline; you are saying there is a rapid accelera-
ion. We are looking for facts, and the evidence we
ave had so far from both members of the public who
ave appeared representing organizations, and particu-
arly from those engaged in this business, is that
aybe television is something that has been added, but
ey do not look to radio as being likely to decline.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, probably there our
inking is based on our local situation. Naturally,
is thing is tied into economics. Our thought was
at if the advertising value goes down, the station's
ssible income goes down, and who is going to main-
in it? If the Government is going to maintain
, that is another matter, but if they presume
ey are going to, well, the C.B.C. has got to con-
der future programming. I, personally, still
ink there is going to be a very considerable swing
the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but the swing may

come in two ways: it may either come in the decline you mention as if it were a fact, or it may come in the fact that television will be an additional service and the radio will move along more or less as it is, maybe slightly changing its emphasis, direction and method.

MR. HYNDMAN: That was the general line of the conversation at the meeting, and this was put in to raise the question: but locally, listening to CFCY broadcasts, there is practically no advertising on the evenings now. There are not the grand old programmes we used to get sponsored by very large firms. They are gradually disappearing. That may be because advertising funds are being diverted, but I would say that the commercially paid for and sponsored programmes are disappearing in the evening. In the larger centres possibly the advertising is sufficient to maintain them all through the year, but I don't think even over C.B.C. there is the same kind of high-class programmes in the evening that there used to be. Somebody will have to maintain the service, is our premise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we are not to take this first paragraph . . .

MR. HYNDMAN: Too seriously.

THE CHAIRMAN: . . . as being a statement of fact, but it is your impression based on those considerations you have mentioned?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: In the next sentence you say:

"The consequent reorientation in the
"industry suggests caution in future
"financial commitments."

Would it be fair to say that is really the point you are making here, that this may be a matter that deserves serious concern in relation to radio commitments?

MR. HYNDMAN: That was our main point.

MR. COYNE: But I take it you are not suggesting in a specific way that the C.B.C. should now cut down its radio service?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, but should they go ahead and spend millions in the future on sound broadcasting when possibly it is going out?

MR. COYNE: You would say if it was shown that it was going out, then the expenditure of the same amount of money they have spent in the past would not be justified?

MR. HYNDMAN: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, you say the fact that the private stations will find it necessary to accelerate their write-offs -- they will only have to do that if, in fact, there is an acceleration of this decline you are talking about. I take it you are not really prepared to defend this statement of fact?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, because we are speaking from a local standpoint. Our committee discussed this thing in no way with CFCY, but we do know their advertising revenue has been cut very considerably

y competition from the C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't really know that?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, we have been told. The ate Colonel Rogers was a friend of mine, and he was omplaining all the time about losing this programme nd that programme.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, the sort of picture we re getting is that there is perhaps a change in the ature of radio programmes. Some favourite of your wn may go off the air, but that doesn't mean it will ot be replaced by some other form of programme, r forms of spot advertising which may, as far as e know, make the total revenue of a station as high r higher than it was before.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, to my listening extent, rom what I have heard, there is nothing coming on in he evenings over our station, and I can only draw y own conclusion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't know, in fact, ether the advertising revenue of CFCY is up or wn from what it was five years ago?

MR. HYNDMAN: Simply by what I was told by e late Colonel Rogers, that they were losing these ogrammes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is one thing to lose a ogramme and it is a different thing to know whether e revenue goes up or down. They may replace it th something.

MR. HYNDMAN: Definitely, I agree.

MR. COYNE: In the fourth paragraph you say:

"In line with accepted practice in other
"fields it would seem apparent that
"such service . . ." --

nd I think that is television service --

". . . in the more remote areas should
"be a Governmental responsibility,
"rather than in populous districts
"where competition among private
"stations should ensure prompt perfor-
"mance, as occurs in other industry.
"This indicates the necessity of
"returning to the principles of pri-
"vate industry believed in by this
"Board . . .":

re you suggesting there that the C.B.C. or the govern-
ng authority should abandon the concept of national
ervice and simply provide some sort of service in
emote and uneconomic areas, and leave the private
ations to operate in the larger centres?

MR. HYNDMAN: Not at all. I am suggesting
e people in the remote areas are just as entitled
T.V. service as those in populous areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from that -- getting
t to remote areas -- what do you mean by this
rase, "the necessity of returning to the principles
private industry"?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, to our understanding
e C.B.C. have gone into the populous districts where
ere is the big advertising revenue, and as business-
n we feel more or less that it should be a private

nterprise matter -- competition, the same as any other usiness; and the normal functions of Government, they ake over the things that are uneconomic. For example, obody could make a lighthouse pay, and yet we have hem.

MR. COYNE: Doesn't it follow you are sugges- ing the C.B.C. not operate in populous areas?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, in our concept of rivate enterprise, we feel this matter can be handled y private enterprise if given the opportunity.

MR. COYNE: Well, doesn't it follow that hat you are suggesting is that the C.B.C. abandon the ational broadcasting service? If they are going to e functioning only in remote areas, they cannot pro- ide a national service, which would not be received n the populous centres?

MR. HYNDMAN: I think the question will be nswered later in the brief. We are talking about perating now, because we have suggested that they rovide a national service available to all stations. e strongly recommend that.

MR. COYNE: I understand your point that here are some points in the latter part of your rief which perhaps bear on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, I want to under- tand what you are proposing, and what you mean by he words you use. You say, "This indicates the ecessity of returning to the principles of private ndustry believed in by this Board." What exactly s it you are saying?

MR. HYNDMAN: Simply that the C.B.C. have aken up the populous districts, where normally com- etition should provide the best service available.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you say they should not ave done that?

MR. HYNDMAN: I don't think so, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you say they should now bandon those?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If they should, then, abandon hem, and not be operating in Charlottetown or Halifax r Toronto, Vancouver or Halifax, but merely in the emote areas, how can you then say they should still rovide a national service?

MR. HYNDMAN: By a programme service. For nstance, in sound broadcasting I am thinking in the ne of sustaining programmes and educational pro- ammes which the C.B.C. always provide. We are recom- nding later here that if they stayed in the field providing these programmes that we should have that rhaps nobody will sponsor, or perhaps they ought not be permitted to sponsor, then we think they would filling their function, because my information is at the private stations were prepared to open T.V. the big cities before the Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you say the C.B.C. should andon the advertising revenue?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aren't you getting yourself d the Board of Trade into the rather odd position

f advocating an increase in taxes?

MR. HYNDMAN: If the C.B.C. were not operating
tations and private enterprise was operating stations,
ney would be collecting revenue and presumably pay-
ng operating costs, except in remote areas, and our
axes would pay for the sustaining programmes that
e should have which advertising won't pay for.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Then you are going
o have no C.B.C. television in the larger centres,
o that there is going to be no means of providing
ose C.B.C. programmes to the people in the larger
entres unless you are going to force the private opera-
rs there to take the sustaining programmes of C.B.C.
llynilly, and probably force them into a loss by
ing it?

MR. HYNDMAN: Our concept was that C.B.C.
rovide these cultural and national interest programmes
sseminating them throughout Canada by their Very
gh Frequency range, and they would have them in the
ties the same as in the remote areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the private stations
ose to carry them.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, I think they should
ve to -- take a proportion, certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: As I see it, you are propo-
ng that the C.B.C. should give up station operation?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they should continue
remote areas?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are saying they hould develop a national programme which would go out y compulsion, and for the sake of argument let us ssume it is pretty much the same kind of national pro- ramme you have today, but you should take away from hem all their advertising revenue: therefore, the verall cost is bound to be higher, isn't it?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, of course, if the rivate stations make a terrific revenue as a result, will go back in income tax to the Dominion Govern- ent.

THE CHAIRMAN: All the same I am talking bout the expenditure of public monies, and are you ot as a Board of Trade advocating an increase in pub- ic expenditure, which is a very odd thing for a oard of Trade to be advocating?

MR. HYNDMAN: Let us take the case in the aritimes: The Dominion Government went into Sackville d spent millions and millions in putting in a station an area that was fairly well serviced already. ould we spend money that way?

THE CHAIRMAN: Isn't it true the Sackville ation is also an international broadcasting unit?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, I am not referring that part.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Hyndman, pursuing the estion which you just asked, I suppose that is only worthwhile expenditure if the station that is ilt is providing a worthwhile service. Do you ink that the C.B.C. stations do not provide a

orthwhile service?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, I am not suggesting that t all, but I am suggesting the private stations ould carry those good programmes which they carry -- he bulk of C.B.C. -- the plain advertising programmes hich we used to get on CFCY. As a matter of fact, hey are carrying very many that CFCY used to carry.

MR. COYNE: Do you further suggest the rivate stations should be compelled to carry those rogrammes?

MR. HYNDMAN: There are regulations at the ment in that regard, and I don't think anybody has y objection to them.

(Page 3684 follows)

MR. COYNE: I know, but is it not vital to your scheme if there is to be a national broadcasting service and no national stations, then you have to have distribution through the private stations?

MR. HYNDMAN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Are you also suggesting that the present network programming of the C.B.C. should be cut down; do you think there are too many programmes produced by the C.B.C.? You speak only of the so-called sustaining programmes, and we have been advised as far as television is concerned that nearly every programme produced on the national system is a sustaining programme in that the advertiser never really pays the full cost of the programme.

MR. HYNDMAN: I am not sufficiently conversant with programmes to answer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: As a general matter, is your concept, without getting into detail, something approximating the present programme character and quality to be continued by C.B.C.?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And that would include, for instance, programmes of a national scale which are of a entertainment nature?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, always provided there is not somebody to come across and pay the bill through advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you were saying the C. B.C. should get out of advertising?

MR. HYNDMAN: The revenue is going to be

ollected by the private stations presumably.

MR. COYNE: But, returning to the Chairman's uestion a moment ago, if the C.B.C. is going to pro- uce programming as it does now, say in television, oth in the information and enlightenment and enter- ainment fields, but it is not to get any advertising, re you not substantially increasing the cost to the xpayer; does that not follow?

MR. HYNDMAN: I do not think so. I do not ink the Government should be in business, I do not ink it should be selling its product.

MR. COYNE: Well, how do you envisage the velopment of national network advertising? The B.C. is going to have the network, it is going to oduce these national programmes ---

THE CHAIRMAN: And the private station gets e advertising.

MR. COYNE: How is the national advertising ch as we are accustomed to today, how does it fit to the picture? What are the mechanics of getting is over the network?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, I do not see why there ould not be private station networks. We suggest private enterprise had an opportunity they would oduce just as good programmes.

MR. COYNE: Have you any facts or figures?

MR. HYNDMAN: We have not been permitted try it in Canada.

MR. COYNE: That is quite true, but on e other hand -- and I am speaking now of television,

nd I am speaking of network entertainment features, f you like -- now we have evidence before us that ne most that can be recovered of the cost of those rogrammes on a very average figure is 40%, 50 % or 0%. Now, it may be suggested that if that is so a rivate operation would have certain savings of cost, t would not cost as much. That can be said but I o not know if it can be proven. But my question ould be this: How can you say, unless you have some acts or figures or studies to back it up, that the rivate commercial network could put on these pro- rammes which commercial revenue at the moment cannot y for?

MR. HYNDMAN: Of course, we are not think- g in terms of an opera that costs $30,000 for one esentation.

MR. COYNE: Neither am I, I am thinking a half-hour variety show; for instance, the G.E. irley Harmer show on Sunday night. I am not think- g of a $30,000 opera.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, there is, unfortunately, thing to guide us except the general feeling that ivate stations, if they were given chain operation, uld pool their resources instead of providing them om the United States.

MR. COYNE: You have this feeling but u have nothing to suggest to us that this is more an a feeling?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, has anybody in Canada?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me take it from another

oint of view. Take this G.E. programme, Showtime, hat is now part of a nationally-produced television ervice. From what you said a moment ago I take it ou would continue to think it would not be a bad dea to keep that kind of programme on a national ser- ice?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, under your scheme the .B.C. will continue to produce Showtime but that Show- ime, just to make it simple, let us assume G.E. pays he whole cost to C.B.C.; now I take you to be saying hat C.B.C. must not take up advertising revenue so hat the whole cost of Showtime will be borne by the axpayers of Canada under your scheme?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And the revenue ---

THE CHAIRMAN: The revenue of whatever G.E. ays will go to the private stations.

MR. HYNDMAN: Of course, there is certain fternoon programming which could be -- just dealing n your general terms, perhaps an arrangement could e made that where a private station or any station is oing to have ~~to have~~ some return for broadcasting ny particular type of -- at least a percentage of ny particular type of programme -- could it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think so, but I am just ooking for the thing here. You say:

"This Board therefore recommends:

" (c) that it withdraw from competi-

" tion for advertising, and depend

" on votes of Parliament, as do other

" Government services;"

Now, I am simply applying your exact words to the specific situation of the present G.E. Showtime, which you say is the type of thing which ought to be in the national programme; that there ought to be a national programme put out by the C.B.C. and you say they should not charge any part of it.

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, we do not know how those costs would be apportioned among the individual stations; we have not a chain in Canada to prove it.

THE CHAIRMAN: This has to do with the national programming which you say the C.B.C. should provide; it is part of a national programme produced by public money. Are you saying they should not get any of it back through advertising from the General Electric Company?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, in effect my own personal opinion is that, rather than put money into a large plant and tying up a lot of money and people in government service, we could put that money into sustaining programmes of a type that the individual advertiser cannot do.

MR. COYNE: Well, you are saying, in effect, that you did not say a moment ago -- that Showtime is a production that should not be produced.

MR. HYNDMAN: No, I do not mean that. There are certain types of thing, granted, that no individual station can produce or perhaps even a chain could produce, and it is that type of thing that I think the Government should deal with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that not a change from hat you were saying a moment ago, because I under- tood that you went along with my suggestion that in eneral terms the C.B.C. should continue to produce he kind of overall programming that they are produ- ing today, and that does include Showtime and the louffe Family and debates and music and entertainment nd variety and enlightenment of various kinds.

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if you want that to the xtent that the public costs of this programme produc- ion -- forget about your station operation for the oment, leave it out -- we are talking now about pro- ramme operation alone, programme production and dis- ribution; are you or are you not saying that to the xtent that some part of these public costs for pro- ramme production can be recovered from advertisers, he C.B.C. should not do it, or should it?

MR. HYNDMAN: Whether these things are ossible or not I do not know, but I do not think the overnment should be selling their services in that ay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, you say we should roduce these things, we should not charge for it?

MR. HYNDMAN: At public cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we should not charge or it?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, I do not think so.

MR. COYNE: Well then, referring to your rst point, the first of your recommendations on

ıge 2:

"That the C.B.C., over a period of time,

"divorce itself from station operation,

"except in remote or uneconomic areas:"

ıat do you have in mind there, that it would sell
ıe stations or dispose of them in some other way?

MR. HYNDMAN: We have not gone into the tails of it, but I do believe something should be ne. Where is the C.N.R. in radio broadcasting? the early days they had stations right across Canada t they have disappeared.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are suggesting, effect, that the present Act be amended because der the present Act the C.B.C. are to give a national oadcasting service, and they could not do it under is scheme, so the Act would require changing; is at it?

MR. HYNDMAN: Not at all; they will just able to give us service, they will have the private ations, at least they will be providing a certain ount of sustaining programmes of the better class at the private stations will be obliged to take. ere is no suggestion that they be ---

MR. COYNE: Dealing with your next point:

"That it provide policy and general

"regulation to all broadcasting stations;"

eaking generally, do you contemplate any different gulations from those presently in force? What rt of regulations do you have in mind that would ply to all broadcasting stations?

MR. HYNDMAN: Very much the type we have
ow except I think most thinking people dislike the
an in business regulating his competitor. I think it
s largely a matter of principle, as Mr. Large said.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you what you mean
"it" in page 2; is that the C.B.C.?

MR. HYNDMAN: From the Commission standpoint
a regulatory body.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You mean the Corpora-
on?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well now, of course, we have
complex organization, one that is operating stations,
e that is providing regulation and providing pro-
ammes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just trying to under-
and this. You have words here that say:

"That it provide policy and general
"regulation to all broadcasting
"stations;"

m simply asking you what you mean by "it"?

MR. HYNDMAN: The C.B.C.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if it is the C.B.C.,
does that go along with -- your recommendation

"That the present organization of the
"C.B.C. be broken down to provide (1)
"the regulating authority suggested
"herein."

l, you have just told me that "it" was the C.B.C.
do the regulating and then a separate organization

to provide operation in remote areas, and a third organization to provide sustaining and educational programmes and possibly technical assistance. Now, do you have a C.B.C. in existence after this is over?

MR. HYNDMAN: Certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: What does it do?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, it is a Commission which is primarily a regulatory body. I mean, now you have one body doing three things, it is judge and jury, and we feel that the Commission should -- the Commission function in the ordinary sense of the word, it should be guiding and directing on behalf of the Canadian people.

MR. COYNE: Would not this likely lead to a good deal more regulation of the private broadcasters than they have now for this reason: if the C.B.C. is to have no outlets for its own programmes, and all its programmes are to be -- and the whole of the network is to be regulated by this Commission, there is going to be quite a substantial amount of regulation.

MR. HYNDMAN: Of course, that is a matter of getting together, a matter of internal regulation, I would say.

MR. COYNE: But a matter of control and compulsion in the end result?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, certainly there would have to be.

MR. COYNE: Well now, in (d), the third section where you are recommending a third board to

rovide sustaining and educational programmes, that rings up the question that we have spoken of a little arlier; the C.B.C. at the moment in its national pro- ramming provides more programmes than I think you ould ordinarily call a sustaining or educational pro- ramme, and a moment ago you indicated that you thought resent programming was generally satisfactory, you ere not recommending that it be cut down, but here you ontemplate a more restrictive type of programme?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, not at all; simply that t is our feeling that it is the main function of the overnment to provide that kind of programming, and I hink if more money were put into that, we would be etter off. We are divorced from fighting for the dvertising dollar and the C.B.C. as such is purely egulating the thing, but it does not matter what De- artment of Government the other two items come under, s I see it. Who runs the stations in the remote reas, for instance, or what Department of Government he production of programmes comes under, so long as e are assured they are going to be produced, and erything is centred on that because if that is to me about we have our chain, our facilities all over nada then.

MR. COYNE: What do you feel -- perhaps u may enlarge upon what you feel is the advantage to is, what I might describe as a very cumbersome and ry costly method of producing and distributing, very rgely the present range of national programmes om the point of view of the public interest, the

ational interest, and not from the point of view of urely the people in private business who are going to ncrease their advertising. In the point of view f the public interest what do you feel are the ad- antages that would flow from this type of organiza- ion?

MR. HYNDMAN: For one thing I think there s a general drift to Socialism in Government, in busi- ss, and I think it is going to grow, and I feel at the C.B.C. is a very large expression of that ing. We feel as a Board of Trade and Chamber of mmerce that we should use every effort to keep Govern- nt out of business. I do not see anything cumber- me, these things are all being done now, it is a estion of who is going to control it.

MR. COYNE: It is not too relevant and I nnot think of perhaps an appropriate example, but Ontario we have an organization called The Ontario dro-Electric Power Commission which is a monopoly, is a Government board which has a monopoly on the neration and distribution of electrical energy in e Province of Ontario. Do you feel that that is ad thing and that the generation and distribution electricity in Ontario should be returned to pri- e enterprise?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, on that point I would e to ask you ---

MR. COYNE: I do not answer questions.

MR. HYNDMAN: I am sorry. I would like to nt out that that board made a very serious mistake

n choosing its cycle and that millions have been pent or are being spent in these current years to onvert Ontario to be the same as the rest of Canada.

MR. COYNE: That does not answer my question, that just indicates that mistakes are made.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take something nearer ome on this principle of Government in business. o you think that it should be left to private industry o provide railway service to the Maritimes?

MR. HYNDMAN: Very questionable, as history ill show it apparently would be uneconomical.

THE CHAIRMAN: And do you feel if the service is known to be uneconomical, no individual person r business could carry it, that the people as a whole ust carry it if it is essential, which they do? Does his really come down to the principle that the Charlottetown Board of Trade think that the Government hould never, in any circumstances, engage in an peration that yields a revenue?

MR. HYNDMAN: That could be properly pro-ded by private taxpaying industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that confines Governnt activities even in broadcasting where in places may be profitable or at other places not profitle, it confines the Government activity to losses?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, that seems to be story, there is no other answer to it that I know , sir. We could go back to the lighthouses.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you one other ing if this is an appropriate time to do it. I

ake it on the bottom of page 1 you are opposed to
hain ownership of radio stations; in other words,
ultiple ownership of radio stations?

MR. HYNDMAN: On a pure basis that we dis-
ike monopoly of any kind -- of a certain type.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you say even with pri-
ate stations there should be some safeguard in
ne operation of networks, but you not only dislike
nopoly, you also are very fond of private enterprise,
nd is it not a private right to own several stations
s well as one?

MR. HYNDMAN: A private right is only insofar
s it is not injuring the public. I own a car but I
nnot drive it up the street at 60 miles an hour
cause it might injure somebody.

THE CHAIRMAN: But is it not an essence of
eedom of enterprise that you should be able to
pand, make your operations grow?

MR. HYNDMAN: I might agree with that with
mitations. This whole thing depends on the use
the atmosphere and it depends necessarily on a
cense and you cannot have unrestricted competition
radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: Might it not be advantage-
s, let us say in the Maritimes, for one company
have several stations to spread the costs a
tle more and to increase the scale of their opera-
ns, and would this not be a legitimate objective
freedom of enterprise?

MR. HYNDMAN: We state with certain safe-

uards ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you say you believe no hain ownership should be possible for obvious reasons.

MR. HYNDMAN: Further down we say ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That is on the operation of tworks, but I am talking about up above where you y:

"It further believes no 'chain' owner-
"ship should be possible for obvious
"reasons."

I am asking you whether your own theories on private terprise do not have some positive advantages in the ain ownership?

MR. HYNDMAN: The brief which was passed ys:

"-- no 'chain' ownership should be
"possible for obvious reasons."

COMMISSIONER STEWART: How far do you go interpreting "chain"? The reason I ask is, that the West we had various suggestions that news-pers, since they are a form of communication, should so be banned from owning stations; would you go at far?

MR. HYNDMAN: I think what we had in mind s coast-to-coast chains which would give any one rson complete control of the country.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: A case came up in monton where there is only one newapaper and that wspaper also owned a radio station.

MR. HYNDMAN: There are no regulations,

believe, in regard to newspapers because they are ot using the atmosphere.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There was a suggestion there that because it was two forms of communication, that it was not in the public interest. I was ondering if you had any views on that subject?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, not other than as expressed.

MR. COYNE: Just one last question; referring o an earlier question that I asked as to whether or ot you feel this scheme of yours would be in the public interest, I take it that your answer was to this ffect: that it would be in the public interest ecause in principle the Government was a Government gency and should not be in business?

MR. HYNDMAN: Right.

MR. COYNE: And you regard broadcasting as business?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are prepared to pay little more for the service in defence of the rinciple?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes. It may not be a case f paying more, it may be a case of diverting Governent funds from, for instance, operating the station t Sackville, which is our nearest one, to producing rogrammes. It may or may not cost more.

THE CHAIRMAN: It may not cost more over bsolute amounts today but it could cost less if you liminate the Sackville station and keep the

vertising revenue.

MR. COYNE: Perhaps your point is that in pport of the principle you do not care whether it sts more or less?

MR. HYNDMAN: I do not think so, our knowdge, of course, is very limited on these things.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I have asked a lot of questions as we went along and I have ne left.

We thank you very much for your brief.

We will now adjourn and resume at 2.30 when are to hear the Mayor.

--The hearings adjourned at 12.45 P.M. until 2.30P.M.

--On resuming at 2.30 P.M.:

HIS WORSHIP LIEUT. COLONEL J. DAVID STEWART, D.S.O., E.D.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, his afternoon we have one brief on the programme nd we are going to be privileged to hear His Worship ayor J.D. Stewart.

We will begin by marking the brief as hibit No. 146.

HIBIT NO. 146: Brief presented by His Worship Lieut. Col. J.D. Stewart, D.S.O., E.D.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please proceed d present your brief as seems best to you.

MAYOR STEWART: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, y I first of all, as Mayor of our historic capital ty, bid you a very formal welcome and a very arty welcome. We are very happy to have you with .

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think you were re this morning when I expressed our appreciation r the arrangements you made for us. It is very easant indeed.

MAYOR STEWART: Thank you. I am very ppy to see that the Federal Government has again d very good judgment in the choice of members the Commission as they did on the Gordon Commis-on, and especially in using the Clan of Stewart.

w that we have the family plug in, I will proceed
th the brief.

The Mayor and Council of the City of Char-
ttetown welcome the opportunity to appear before
e Royal Commission on Broadcasting to present their
ews in conjunction with and in support of the
ief which has been submitted by The Island Radio
oadcasting Company Limited, the owners and opera-
rs of broadcasting station CFCY radio, and CFCY
levision.

Naturally, our submission is influenced by
e tremendous contribution this Company has made in
e everyday life of Charlottetown in the way of
blic information, in the influencing of the social,
ral and cultural life of our community, as well as
the intellectual and artistic.

We in Charlottetown feel extremely proud
at one of our Charlottetown men, the late Colonel
S. Rogers, is acclaimed one of Canada's leading
oneers in the broadcasting industry, and while
dio Broadcasting began in Canada in 1922, the
te Colonel had set up his experimental station
1921 and was relaying to us programmes from Ameri-
n stations when direct reception was nil.

In the year 1924, two years after the
ficial inception of radio broadcasting in Canada,
Y was founded as a private commercial enterprise.

In 1929 broadcasting in Canada became
ional, and in 1932 the Government of Canada enter-
the field, through the Canadian Radio Broadcasting

ommission and in 1936 through the C.B.C.

After the C.B.C. was set up, restrictions ere placed on private stations, and their existence became precarious, but in 1951 a second Commission permitted them to continue to function, and eventually their operation became the accepted policy of the Government.

While private stations, both radio and T.V., re the recognized and accepted policy of the Govern-nt, nevertheless they are restricted, and we feel his is definitely a discrimination against private nterprise. This discrimination then has led to great difference in the status of Government and rivately-owned stations operating in Canada.

While we agree that the C.B.C. is well dministered, nevertheless it is felt that they should ot have a monopoly, especially now with respect to elevision broadcasting. We feel, too, that the B.C. is in a rather dictatorial position when it n control and regulate broadcasting in Canada and the same time be itself competitive with private nterprise.

This all-embracing power of the C.B.C. ves rise to situations where it is in actual con-ol with respect to the dissemination of important blic information of purely public interest. This n be used sometimes, to the detriment of the public od. Under C.B.C. regulations, all radio stations e prohibited from advertising or broadcasting any formation pertaining to elections, Federal, Pro-

icial or Civic, forty-eight hours before the elec-
on is held, despite the fact that it is permissible
advertise in the newspapers even on election day.
inflexibility of these, and similar rules and regu-
ions of the C.B.C. has resulted in considerable
ticism in local communities. There is further
ticism that local C.B.C. stations are too restric-
in the discriminatory powers of their local
agers, where the facilities of their stations
ld be made available to local community and region-
purposes, more especially when local emergencies
other situations arise wherein the use of broad-
ting can perform an important local service.
se occasions and circumstances may not appear of
at significance when viewed from the national level,
they might be of tremendous importance locally.

The people of Charlottetown also have good
son to appreciate the great role and contribution
t CFCY is playing throughout the Maritimes, New-
ndland and parts of Quebec. CFCY has willingly
generously placed its facilities at the service
the municipalities within the scope of its region,
the public services of this station extended
m the most minute requests to the promoting of the
t worthy campaigns. It has been a very substan-
l help to Charlottetown and the surrounding com-
ities. The management of CFCY has demonstrated
ir desire and ability to measure up to the high
ponsibilities entailed in the operating of such
important means of public communication. They

ave been most helpful in making their services reely available for informing the people with respect o local public affairs. It is their desire to con- inue to offer acceptable public services.

It is the opinion of the City of Charlotte- own that privately-owned broadcasting stations such s CFCY should enjoy the full privileges and rights ith respect to the operations as are enjoyed by he C.B.C. We feel that the private and public roadcasting of CFCY, both radio and television, hould be placed on an equal footing with any other ystem that may exist in Canada.

We heartily endorse their contention "that ll radio and television operators should be placed nder the authority of an independent regulatory oard, such board to be completely devoid of any nterest in the operation of radio or television sta- ions or networks".

The setting up of such an independent regu- atory board would not prejudice or adversely affect he C.B.C. as a Government-owned broadcasting system. or would the placing of a privately-owned broad- asting station on a full and equal competitive foot- ng with publicly-owned broadcasting retard the ex- ansion or development of either, but to the contrary, e feel it would stimulate the growth in Canada of hese two important media of better and larger com- unication. We feel, too, that it would tend to mprove the various programmes, and have the effect f making this industry of broadcasting more sound,

d on a solid basis in the interests of all Canadian
tizens.

There are many views with respect to the
aracter and quality of the programmes heard on
dio and television. There is such a diversity of
inion as to what constitutes good and acceptable
tertainment that to advance one's ideas on this
bject would be useless. However, programmes should
of the widest latitude within the bounds set by
opriety and good moral standards. This should be
e basis on any restricted regulation regarding pro-
ammes. Due regard, however, should be given to
e fact that, neither radio or television are quite
e same as the printed word.

A book or a newspaper can be privately pur-
ased and privately read and privately absorbed.
dio and television, once on the air, are available
the hearing and viewing of the large mass public,
cluding impressionistic youth. What may be accep-
le for a mature mind is not always most acceptable
the mind of a growing child. It would be de-
rable, therefore, without in any way infringing
n the basic principles of our democratic freedoms
we were to recognize that the programme content
radio and television programmes reaches more than
individual and discerning viewer who is able to
ectively appraise their qualitative and moral
tent.

There is also a diversity of opinion between
rican and Canadian programmes, and as to whether

not Canadian programmes should have preferred hours
d that programmes originating other than Canadian
es, should be used as fillers. This, however,
uld be left also to the regulatory board. We have
specific ideas to advance in this regard but in
e matter of programmes sponsored as a means of
mmercial advertising, we do feel that there is
r too much interruption in the programmes with re-
rrent advertising flashes.

As the seller of nationally advertised
oducts, it just kills me to say that.

The art of television advertising is improv-
g but it has a long way to go before it has produced
e kind of appeals and subleties which will not pro-
ke some irritation in the public mind. Commercial
vertisers and those associated with the prepara-
on of copy and background for television advertising
uld be rendering an acceptable public service and
directly enhance the prestige of their products if
y displayed more ingenuity and finesse in the
ner of presenting their advertisements.

This, gentlemen, concludes our brief, but
would like once again to reiterate that we have
sented this brief in conjunction with and in support
the brief presented by The Island Radio Broadcasting
pany Limited, CFCY, with the hope that your
rned Commission will consider the recommending to
powers that be that private enterprise in the
adcasting industry be placed on the same status as
other form of broadcasting in Canada. We feel

hat those in the private industry of broadcasting
n our democratic country should have the same
ights as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, an
rganization set up by and responsible to our demo-
ratic Government at Ottawa.

We enjoy free enterprise. Let us not
ave discriminatory competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.
efore Mr. Coyne starts, perhaps I should make clear
gain at the opening of this session, as I have done
t most others -- I forgot to do it today -- about
ur procedure and our method of questioning. You
ere here I think this morning but I do not think every-
ne in the room was. We are only asking questions
or the purpose of getting at the facts, and there is
o indication of any conclusion or judgment in any
ay.

MR. COYNE: In the paragraph commencing
n page 3 near the top you say:

"While private stations, both in radio
"and T.V., are the recognized and accep-
"ted policy of the Government, neverthe-
"less they are restricted, and we feel
"this is definitely a discrimination
"against private enterprise."

wonder if you could develop that a little more, the
ay in which you feel they are restricted and why
t is a discrimination against them?

MAYOR STEWART: They are not permitted
o form their own networks for one thing.

MR. COYNE : Any others?

MAYOR STEWART: That is a very important

ne.

MR. COYNE: You feel, in other words,

at there should be no restriction or control over

twork broadcasting?

MAYOR STEWART: That is right.

MR. COYNE: In the sense that the private

ations should be ---

MAYOR STEWART: Be allowed or permitted to

rm their own network, either in bits and pieces or

complete national one.

MR. COYNE: What does that do in terms of

e dissemination of the national broadcasting service

the C.B.C.?

MAYOR STEWART: Well, would you clear your-

lf on that? I do not understand you.

MR. COYNE: All right. If there was com-

ete freedom to form networks, how would the C.B.C.

able to continue to broadcast its programmes

tionally in those areas where it uses the facilities

private stations and does not have stations of

s own?

MAYOR STEWART: They would be on their own.

MR. COYNE: How do you mean?

MAYOR STEWART: I envisage a competition --

at least competition between two national networks

ssibly, or you may have a local network, but there

think the answer would be through your separate

gulatory body.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I think Mr. Coyne s on is this: that the present concept as it has een put to us is a concept of an obligation on the .B.C. by statute to put out a national broadcasting ervice. It has over history, and it has not been oo precise at the outset, but gradually the system as developed of this national broadcasting service s provided by the C.B.C. and put out, apparently, hrough its own affiliated stations, and apparently hrough privately-owned stations. Now, suppose you re a privately-owned station on the Trans-Canada etwork or, let us take television, which may be impler; there is a television national programme. ow, whether it is three hours or eight hours a day it oes not matter, it is a programme. Now, the moment he privately-owned television station is free to reate its own networks, would we not get a lot of onflict in what you might call the time-tables?

MAYOR STEWART: I would not think so. How ny areas in Canada have you today that have not got .B.C. coverage through their own station?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am talking of television ow. You will not have C.B.C. coverage in Charlotte-own until such time as you get it through a private levision station.

MAYOR STEWART: We are looking at C.B.C. levision right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Through Halifax?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: From Moncton?

MAYOR STEWART: Both. I personally look at alifax more than Moncton.

MR. COYNE: You can receive Halifax here n Charlottetown?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are many areas in anada where it is overlapping; certainly Peterborough, ntario does not get direct C.B.C.; Edmonton does not, askatoon does not. You can find numerous areas in anada where you cannot get it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There are areas in anada where you cannot get radio too.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. But, if you ave the concept of a national broadcasting service hich is now in the Act, the case has been put that t is very difficult to give freedom for private net- orks and still keep the available stations open to arry ---

MAYOR STEWART: Has that not been brought bout due to the restricted Act?

THE CHAIRMAN: Or by the concept of having national broadcasting service. And what our ques- ion really is, do you suggest that it is no part f the function of the C.B.C., or whoever replaces , to provide a national broadcasting service? Do ou go that far?

MAYOR STEWART: No, I won't go that far.

MR. COYNE: Well, will you go this far, to ay that the C.B.C. service should be provided by .B.C. stations and if the C.B.C. wants this network

should build its own stations?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes. In other words, they ll grow along with the private network if that came to being.

MR. COYNE: Do you disagree with the present ncept of the C.B.C. distributing its programmes in rt through private stations?

MAYOR STEWART: No, I do not object to it; think it could be added to, supplemented.

MR. COYNE: Well --- ?

MAYOR STEWART: You just answered your own estion a few minutes ago.

MR. COYNE: To be more precise, let us take e situation in the Maritimes. Although you say you ceive the Halifax station am I right in thinking that not generally true, that you perhaps have a powerful t?

MAYOR STEWART: No, it is generally true in arlottetown. I just have an ordinary set.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There would be certain cts of the Island that would not receive Halifax?

MAYOR STEWART: The Eastern part would get strong, and as you go west it would decrease.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So there would be me parts that do not get it at all?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: For the purpose of an example, us assume we are speaking of the western part of Island, which will be reached by CFCY-TV; do feel that CFCY should not be required to carry

.B.C. programmes into the western part of the Island?

MAYOR STEWART: I think they should have me choice.

MR. COYNE: They should have some choice?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Not the people of the western rt of Prince Edward Island?

MAYOR STEWART: Well, I think CFCY would ow what the public would like or what they do not ike. They should know, but at the moment they have ogrammes thrust down their throat by the C.B.C. where e listener can turn the set off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us go on with this for moment. Supposing you have CFCY television operating part of the national network?

MAYOR STEWART: As it is now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, as it is now. With or thout variation for its own shows, the moment it operating as part of the network, the national ser- ce carrying it out, how can you say that it should ve complete freedom to form its own networks? Ob- ously you have to create some kind of priority.

MAYOR STEWART: Not necessarily. Could y not work together? They could take certain grammes from the national network?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how the nation- service, assuming it is worth putting out ---

MAYOR STEWART: I think this is one prin- le our people object to, having these thrust on m whether they like them or not. There is no

stinction left to the station.

THE CHAIRMAN: The distinction you speak of pretty mixed.

MAYOR STEWART: Just what do you mean by at?

THE CHAIRMAN: I simply mean; it is one ing to talk about the concept of a national service get out; it is another thing to ask a local station give up some good, fat advertising revenues perhaps cause a less desirable programme was available at e time but it was being paid for. It is not as mple as saying it is being forced down their throats, may easily be that the programme that would be rced down somebody's throat may be a more inferior ogramme because it was being paid for.

MAYOR STEWART: It could be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Than a network programme ich was not being paid for. This forcing down the roat is a multiple operation.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to put your nt this way, Mayor Stewart: that you are sugges- g that there be complete freedom on the part of private stations to be able to form their private works and they should be permitted to do so re- dless of what effect that may have on the distri- ion of national services?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: So, in effect, you put the .C. national service on a lower priority?

MAYOR STEWART: Not necessarily, it stands

its own feet.

MR. COYNE: Well, you did agree with my
lier suggestion that if the two were in conflict ---

MAYOR STEWART: That is right.

MR. COYNE: --- the private stations should
permitted to form their networks regardless of
t effect it has on the national service?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: How can they stand on their
feet against the combination I put to you a few
utes ago? It is not just standing on their own
t; in one case there is money to be made and in the
er there is not, which is really not just standing
its own feet.

MR. COYNE: In the next paragraph you say:

"While we agree that the C.B.C. is well
"administered, nevertheless it is felt
"that they should not have a monopoly,
"especially now with respect to tele-
vision broadcasting."

, you have mentioned that you receive the C.B.C.
ion from Halifax; I believe you also receive the
ton station, and shortly you will be able to re-
e CFCY Charlottetown. Why do you say that C.B.C.
a monopoly with respect to the television broad-
ing at the present time?

MAYOR STEWART: Because it is just in the
of Halifax -- there is just one T.V. station
e -- and that applies to these other centres in
da. Is that not correct?

MR. COYNE: There is only one in Halifax, t, by the same token, there is only going to be one levision station in Charlottetown. Do you think that a monopoly?

MAYOR STEWART: Not necessarily.

MR. COYNE: Well, what is the difference? rely if the C.B.C. has a monopoly in Halifax because is the only television station there, then CFCY will ve a monopoly in Charlottetown if it is the only levision station here.

MAYOR STEWART: That is right, but the mono- ly by the C.B.C. is that they say no other station n go into Halifax, no other station can go into -- ere are six cities.

MR. COYNE: They also say no other station n go into Charlottetown under the present policy.

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You do agree the monopoly situa- on can arise in other cities where the monopoly is ercised by a private station?

MAYOR STEWART: That is right.

MR. COYNE: And you say a little further wn in the paragraph:

"We feel, too, that the C.B.C. is in a "rather dictatorial position when it "can control and regulate broadcasting "in Canada and at the same time be "itself be competitive with private "enterprise".

other stages you suggest the private broadcasters

hould have the same rights as the C.B.C. Is there ot some difference in view of the fact that perhaps hey do have different rights but they also have ifferent obligations? The C.B.C. is charged with he obligation of providing a national broadcasting ervice, whereas private stations are charged with no uch statutory obligation.

MAYOR STEWART: Statutory?

MR. COYNE: There will be some difference in et-up, if you like, between the two?

MAYOR STEWART: Well, the point I am making , you have the position of the C.B.C. making the egulations for competition. It would be in the same osition if the Bank of Canada established in Canada to- y commercial banks in cities across Canada and still ade the rules for the whole banking system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this is one of the estions ---

MAYOR STEWART: You have heard this before, is not new.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but I am just searching r as precise a distinction as we can draw and as ny helps as we can find as to how it is, and in at respects, the C.B.C. is competitive with private terprise in this field, as we have it today.

MAYOR STEWART: They are competitive in is regard, Mr. Fowler, that they can go out -- in e instance I mentioned -- and I am not an expert broadcasting -- they can go out and sell a package al on advertising, whereas an individual station is

ft out of that field completely; whereas if they had
ven a Maritime network of private stations or a
uebec network or a Western network, they in turn could
mpete with the C.B.C. on the package deal of adver-
ising.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I can see where you
ould create a situation by producing a network where
ou would get competition between the C.B.C. and the
ivate stations, but I am asking you in the present
tuation in what competition consists, and I only
ep on asking this question because I want as much
ght on the subject as we can get.

MAYOR STEWART: I have just given you one.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I do not think so. You
id if certain changes were made.

MAYOR STEWART: Well, they can do that
w and the private stations cannot; therefore, it is
unfair competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not competition at all.

MAYOR STEWART: You are kicking the word
ound.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to find out
at the word means. In asking this question in other
aces we have the suggestion made that there is com-
tition for audience; that is a special kind of com-
tition.

MAYOR STEWART: Well, it is competition;
u are selling a bill of goods and they are newspapers
a sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not selling anything,

t is not subscription television.

MAYOR STEWART: Does the C.B.C. not do any dvertising?

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been suggested to s they do not do enough.

MAYOR STEWART: I have heard soap operas; s that not selling? You are competing for time.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking about selling o the audience?

MAYOR STEWART: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are not selling the rogramme to the audience.

MAYOR STEWART: But here, if I was for- inate enough to be a manufacturer of soap, I have omething to sell the public, the C.B.C. -- due to the ict that they have a network -- can make a much more ttractive deal for the sale of soap to the public han the private station.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, they are selling a fferent commodity, are they not?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They are selling a rger deal?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes, they are selling a rger deal and the private station has to compete th the C.B.C. for their revenue from that adver- sing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then that is somewhat the me point as we had this morning; the C.B.C., in fect, by selling its network to the soap company y prevent the soap company from having a lot of

eparate deals with private companies?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel this competition hould work both ways?

MAYOR STEWART: Definitely.

MR. COYNE: That is, that the C.B.C. should e in the field of competing for local advertising ith the private stations, which they do not do now n radio?

MAYOR STEWART: Sure.

MR. COYNE: Well then, you say at the top of ge 4:

"This all-embracing power of the C.B.C.
"gives rise to situations where it is
"in actual control with respect to the
"dissemination of important public
"information of purely public interest."

MAYOR STEWART: Then I go on.

MR. COYNE: Yes, you go on:

"This can be used sometimes, to the
"detriment of the public good."

ll you tell me what you mean by "actual control"?

MAYOR STEWART: I go on and explain that. is right there in front of you.

MR. COYNE: No, I do not think you do.

MAYOR STEWART: "Under C.B.C. regulations,
"all radio stations are prohibited from
"advertising or broadcasting any infor-
"mation pertaining to elections --"

at is what I mean.

MR. COYNE: And you are dealing purely with he aspect of the political broadcasts?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You are not suggesting that .B.C. has monopoly on dissemination of news?

MAYOR STEWART: Oh, no.

(Page 3721 follows)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think on that point, Mr. tewart, it perhaps, for the sake of the record, is air to point out that it is not C.B.C. regulations.

MAYOR STEWART: No, I found that out his morning.

MR. COYNE: So that you are not speaking of he control of news?

MAYOR STEWART: No, definitely not.

MR. COYNE: I understand.

MAYOR STEWART: And there has been a glar-ng instance of this; I don't know whether you are amiliar with it, but it happened in another part of anada where there was a plebiscite on a Public Works roject, and it had to receive a majority vote of the ublic before bonds could be issued, and permission as asked to use the broadcasting station on the day f the plebiscite in order to make sure the people ould go out and vote. It was a good thing because eople are lackadaisical on these matters. Ottawa uled "no"; they had to stop forty-eight hours before ne plebiscite.

MR. COYNE: This, of course, is a criti-sm of the provision in the Act . . .

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: . . . and which also appears in ne Election Act, in regard only to Dominion elections, ther than a criticism of the C.B.C. A little fur-er on you speak of the "inflexibility of these, and milar rules and regulations of the C.B.C. has sulted in considerable criticism in local communi-

ies"; what do you mean by the "inflexibility"?

MAYOR STEWART: Just carry on and read a ittle further.

MR. COYNE: "There is further criticism "that local C.B.C. stations are too "restricted in the discriminitory powers "of their local managers, where the "facilities of their stations could "be made available to local community "and regional purposes . . .":

uestion number one, do you mean to indicate that you hink there should be more discretionary powers in the .B.C. regulations?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Particularly in the hands of he local managers?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question there: oes that really sort of come to this, that you recog- ize certain rules of the game have to be done sub- ect to certain exceptions, but they are too cumber- ome at the moment -- too centralized?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes. In other words, if e wanted some important Maritime message, something e wanted to go over in a hurry -- and there are three aritime Provinces -- of a community nature, we hould be able to call up and take it for granted hat the manager of the station has some brains and he nows what should go over the air and what should not, ut he has to go to Ottawa, and by the time you get

ne answer your need has gone.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think you have to ecognize at the same time there could be restrictions n him due to a programme that had been bought for hat particular time.

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So that I can see ifficulties -- some, but not insurmountable ones -- ut there is some difficulty in giving him too wide a iscretionary power.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this regard have you had ny actual experiences in which desirable things were ought and have not been permitted because it has aken too long to get the permission?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes, we have had that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The rules and regulations do ow in a number of places give discretion.

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: On page 6 towards the bottom f the page you are dealing again with a point I hink we discussed:

"It is the opinion of the City of
"Charlottetown that privately-owned
"broadcasting stations such as CFCY
"should enjoy the full privileges
"and rights with respect to the
"operations as are enjoyed by the C.B.C."

ou mentioned the specific matter of networks?

MAYOR STEWART: We have covered that.

MR. COYNE: Are there any other aspects on

nich you feel their privileges and rights at present re less than full?

MAYOR STEWART: Not any more than I would are to go into here, no.

MR. COYNE: So you are limiting yourself to he matter of networks?

MAYOR STEWART: I think I would be on safe round.

THE CHAIRMAN: And to complete that page, it ould be that that would place the private stations on n equal footing?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: On the next page you are speaking of the setting up of an independent regulatory ody and you say:

"Nor would the placing of a privately-
"owned broadcasting station on a full
"and equal competitive footing with
"publicly-owned broadcasting retard
"the expansion or development of either."

re you again thinking there in terms of network?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: It is in that particular that ou feel . . .

MAYOR STEWART: Particular field.

MR. COYNE: . . . that you feel the activities f the private field in a business way are retarded t the moment?

MAYOR STEWART: Restricted.

MR. COYNE: In your next section you are

ealing with programmes, and you point out that neither
adio nor television are quite the same as the printed
ord, and beginning at the bottom of page 8 you say:

"It would be desirable, therefore,
"without in any way infringing upon
"the basic principles of our demo-
"cratic freedoms if we were to recognize
"that the programme content of radio
"and television programmes reaches
"more than the individual and discerning
"viewer who is able to objectively
"appraise their qualitative and moral
"content."

o you feel that there should be regulation of pro-
ramme content in order to ensure that factors such
s these are taken account of?

MAYOR STEWART: I don't know whether it
ould be done by regulation or education. I don't
ike too many regulations.

MR. COYNE: You say you don't know. Per-
aps you can tell me just what you are suggesting
ere -- whether you think it should be by regulation,
r whether it is merely an exhortation?

MAYOR STEWART: I think it is more of an
xhortation. When you look at the T.V. programmes
nd find the children are coming up shooting guns, and
o on, the type of programme is wrong, and people are
ot using enough sense.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel exhortation is an
ffective way in which to accomplish this type of

esult?

MAYOR STEWART: I am scared if you put regu-ation in that we are going back to the system we don't ike, that it will be in the hands of some bureaucrats n Ottawa and there will be too much control.

MR. COYNE: What about the matter of adver-ising content which is the next subject, and you eal with it along a somewhat similar line, and you ay:

"We do feel that there is far too much
"interruption in the programmes with
"recurrent advertising flashes."

here are certain regulations at the moment respecting he number of spot announcements and advertisements, nd that sort of thing: Do you feel that is an appro-riate sphere for regulation?

MAYOR STEWART: I would say so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would say so?

MAYOR STEWART: I would say so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Of course, there re regulations in regard to that now: Do you think hey are being broken?

MAYOR STEWART: I think they are, definitely.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So that there is a axity on the part of C.B.C.?

MAYOR STEWART: In enforcing them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In enforcing their wn regulations?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes, and there is also now machine known as a "blab-off", which is very

ffective. They have cut out all advertising with
ne press of a button.

MR. COYNE: Do you feel it is possible to
ontrol advertising by regulation without in any way
nfringing upon the basic principles of our democratic
reedoms?

MAYOR STEWART: I doubt it.

MR. COYNE: In other words, there is some
nfringement?

MAYOR STEWART: Definitely.

MR. COYNE: And you think that in the adver-
sing sphere that infringement is justified?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just one last general question
these matters of regulation, such as advertising:
at is your objection to the C.B.C. Board of Governors
gulating these matters as heretofore? In other
rds, what advantage do you feel, particularly in
rms of the public interest, would flow from having
independent regulatory body dealing with these regu-
tions?

MAYOR STEWART: With these particular regu-
tions I wouldn't take any exception to the present
ard, but the overall extent I am talking about is
at the C.B.C. Board of Governors are operating their
n business in competition with private industry.
th the particular regulation that you have just men-
oned ---

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say that
u feel this is a matter of principle?

MAYOR STEWART: Yes.

MR. COYNE: You are not really concerned articularly with the actual regulations or even how ney are administered or applied?

MAYOR STEWART: It is mainly a matter of rinciple.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is the basis of my earlier uestion about trying to define exactly where this ompetition exists, and what it is, because a moment go you said that the C.B.C. Board of Governors are perating their own business in competition with private ndustry.

MAYOR STEWART: Are they not?

THE CHAIRMAN: If they are not, in fact, oing so ---

MAYOR STEWART: Are they not, in fact? Do agree on that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure we have agreed anything. I haven't agreed on anything, but it ems to me we are still lacking any precise definition where this competition exists.

MAYOR STEWART: I thought I sold you on that e.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure this is com- tition. The point we are really up against is is: We are asked to look into the finances, we are l concerned about the finance problems of radio and levision, especially as things grow and colour tele- sion comes and a host of other things; finances are the very root of what we are concerned with. Now, y separate regulatory body, as anybody who knows

nything about such matters, is going to cost some oney, and I don't think $75,000 to $100,000 a year stimate would be too far out. Before we start ecommending $100,000 a year expenditure to the Govern- ent we ought to be sure the people of this country re going to get value for their money.

MAYOR STEWART: That is what you are employed or.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is what we are ere for, and I must say I find it somewhat difficult o see the justification for this added expenditure hen all that can be said for it is that we will feel etter about it, that it is a matter of principle -- it goes counter to democratic systems", and the like. would like to be sure that we are getting from it ome real good.

MAYOR STEWART: You want to get beyond the latitudes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have been trying to. am not suggesting you are guilty of that. This is ur problem, and I am stating it to you frankly be- ause it is so easy to say, "It is a high-sounding rinciple".

MAYOR STEWART: Well, what price principle?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, make sure "principle" eans something, and this is the reason for these robing questions and persistent demands to make eople define their terms.

Mr. Stewart, we are most grateful to you. t has been a particularly interesting and pleasant

iscussion we have had. I have asked you all my
uestions as I went along, and Mr. Coyne went through
he brief. I would like again to thank you not
nly for the brief and the interest you have taken
n our direct work, but for all the very pleasant
elcome you gave us and the facilities you put at
ur disposal here. We have enjoyed the stay at
harlottetown even though it was very brief.

MAYOR STEWART: We are very pleased to have
ad you with us, and we suggest, once you put aside
our labours, you come back to Prince Edward Island
nd spend your holidays here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that completes our
earings here. I want to thank all those who took
ne trouble to present briefs, and also those who
ame here to listen.

We will now adjourn, and I think we are
esuming hearings in Fredericton on Monday morning,
nd we have certain visits to make and work to do in
ne meantime at some of the stations en route.

--The hearings adjourned at 3.10 P.M., until Monday, June 25, 1956, at 10.00 A.M.

I N D E X

UBMISSIONS BY: Page

THE ISLAND RADIO BROADCASTING COMPANY LIMITED. ... 3598
Mr. R.F. Large.
Mrs. K.S. Rogers.
Mr. Wm. Keith Rogers.

THE PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE. ... 3642
Mr. J.L. Dewar.

THE CHARLOTTETOWN BOARD OF TRADE. ... 3672
Mr. B. Rogers.
Mr. R.E. Taylor.
Mr. F.W. Hyndman.

HIS WORSHIP LIEUT. COLONEL J. DAVID STEWART, D.S.O., E.D. ... 3703

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

o.	Description	Page
43	Brief submitted by The Island Radio Broadcasting Company Limited, Charlottetown, P.E.I.	3598
44	Brief of The Prince Edward Island Federation of Agriculture.	3642
45	Brief of The Charlottetown Board of Trade.	3672
46	Brief presented by His Worship Lieut. Col. J.D. Stewart, D.S.O., E.D.	3703

24

ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

BROADCASTING

HEARINGS

HELD AT

FREDERICTON, N.B. JUNE 25, 1956

V. 24

I N D E X T O B R I E F S

Fredericton, June 25th, 1956

Page

BROADCASTING STATION CFNB

Mr. Malcolm Neill
Mr. J.T.H. Fenety 3734

HUMANITIES ASSOCIATION OF CANADA,
FREDERICTON BRANCH

Prof. A. Lucas
Prof. D.L.C. Miller
Prof. W.A.G. McAndrew
Prof. D. R. Galloway 3814

UNIVERSITE du SACRE-COEUR

Rev. Pere L. Cormier 3848

L'ASSOCIATION AGRICOLE du
DISTRICT AGRONOMIQUE NO. 3

Mr. P. Girard
Mr. G. Gaudet 3874

NEW BRUNSWICK FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. L. Sloat
Mr. A. Arsenault 3894

FREDERICTON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. R. Rogers 3917

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

The Sittings of the Commission commenced in Fredericton, New Brunswick, in the Legislative Chamber at 10.00 a.m. on Tuesday, June 25th, 1956.

- - - -

PRESENT:

THE CHAIRMAN	ROBERT M. FOWLER
COMMISSIONER	EDMOND TURCOTTE
COMMISSIONER	JAMES STEWART

- - - -

COMMISSION COUNSEL	JOHN M. COYNE
	A. J. de GRANDPRE

- - - -

SECRETARY	PAUL PELLETIER

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now start the hearings here in Fredericton. I would like to begin by expressing our appreciation to the Government authorities here in Fredericton for making this Legislative Chamber available to us for the meetings and for the other arrangements that have been made. We will be holding hearings today and tomorrow.

Just a word about our procedure. All the briefs have been filed and we are anxious that they should be presented either by reading or by summary by those who are presenting them and after that we propose to ask some questions about the briefs. As I have said several times in previous hearings, these questions are designed only to bring out the meaning and the exact, full view of the sponsors of the briefs. I hope no one will read into any questions any suggestion that we have formed any judgment or reached any conclusions of any kind because we are not going to do that until we have heard all the evidence and completed all our studies.

The Honourable Hugh John Fleming is with us today, and we are most happy to have him. Perhaps the Premier would care to say a few words.

THE HONOURABLE HUGH JOHN FLEMING (Premier of New Brunswick): Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen: I deem it a great privilege to welcome you to New Brunswick on behalf of the Government and the people of this Province. We have watched with great interest

your meetings that have been held and we are very pleased to place the facilities of this Chamber at your disposal.

This Chamber, we feel, is most historic; it has many stories written around it and we in New Brunswick are very proud of it. We feel this Chamber is one of the older chambers in the Dominion and also a most proper setting for a Commission of inquiry such as yours. We are all, of course, interested in the inquiry which you are making and the work which you are doing and the report which will ultimately come out of it, which, of course, we trust, as good Canadians, will be of good to all of Canada.

We are most pleased to welcome you, and you may be sure the Government is prepared to extend to you the fullest co-operation at all times. I think that is all I have to say. It is nice to have you here, it is nice to see that we meet under such favourable auspices with everything except the weather and of course we cannot control the weather. Perhaps if we could control the weather we would not be doing any better job than is being done now.

I thank you very much for giving me notice of this meeting. I am indebted to Mr. Neill for having informed me as to the hour of your meeting and with these few words I will let you go ahead and get down to work. May I repeat that we are most pleased to have you here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your remarks and for coming, and while I know you are busy, if

there are any times you can sit in on the deliberations we would be more than delighted to see you here.

HON. MR. FLEMING: I shall look forward to seeing you before you leave.

- - - -

SUBMISSION OF
BROADCASTING STATION CFNB

Appearances:

Mr. Malcolm Neill

Mr. J. T. H. Fenety

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The first brief on our list is that of Radio Station CFNB of Fredericton, and I understand Mr. Malcolm Neill, the General Manager, will present the brief, and Mr. Fenety appears with him. The first stage of presentation, Mr. Neill, is to mark your brief as Exhibit No. 147, and I understand you also have a supplement to that brief which we will mark as Exhibit No. 148.

EXHIBIT NO. 147: Brief presented by Radio Station CFNB, Fredericton

EXHIBIT NO. 148: Supplement to brief presented by Radio Station CFNB, Fredericton

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Neill, you have been present at one or two of our hearings before

and know something of the procedure. We hope you will either read or at least summarize your brief so we may have it in our minds when we start our questioning.

MR. NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I read my brief, we have several members of our staff and I would like very much to have you meet them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

MR. NEILL: Miss Betty McDonald, our Continuity writer; Mr. George Mountain, our Continuity editor; Miss Helen Harvey, who has been with us for two years as Continuity writer, and she is also a member of the University Women's Club; Miss Winnifred Wright,who has been with us three years, and who is Secretary to the General Manager; Mrs. Stafford, who has been with us seven years, who is our accountant, and I think it is interesting that Mrs. Stafford herself does all the accounting; Mr. John Porteous, who has been with us for one year; Mrs. Ingles, who has been with us five years as our traffic manager, and she handles all the traffic; Miss Jacqueline Michaud, our receptionist; Mr. Albert Fisher, who has been with us eight years; Mr. Gene Smith, an announcer who has been with us five years; Mr. H. L. McPhee, our programme director, who has been with us five years. Mr. McPhee is president of the New Brunswick branch of the War Amputations of Canada and also president of Christ Church Cathedral choir. These are the members of the

staff who are here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I trust you are still able to keep the station operating?

MR. NEILL: We have a skeleton staff.

"Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, in presenting this brief we would, at the outset, respectfully bring to the attention of the Commissioners the fact that CFNB was the first radio broadcasting station to operate in the Maritime Provinces -- having operated in this field and under the same ownership since 1923. In the light of our thirty-three years' service to the public, through varying stages of growth and development of the broadcasting industry, we suggest that, if for no other reason than our experience, this station's views should be made known to the Commission.

"Canadian broadcasting, in the beginning, was developed entirely by those early pioneers who devoted their time, effort, and money to develop what they considered to be one of the greatest forces for good of all time. In those days the gratitude of the listeners and the reaction of public and private groups was ample reward for these pioneers who seldom, if ever, operated at a profit. Service to the community was and still is the guiding factor in our operation. Up until 1930, Canada's broadcasters operated without Government assistance or control and truly laid the foundation of the broadcasting industry of today.

"It is a general misconception that state-owned broadcasting stations are necessary to provide service to rural areas distant from large centres of population. This, however, is far from the fact. The rural areas of the Maritimes were well served by the pioneer broadcasting stations long before any CBC stations were established, and in the main CBC stations of the Maritimes are today serving the identical areas covered by the private stations, and to a considerable extent duplicating the programme service provided by these stations.

"Had the Federal Government not limited the private stations to low power and local and regional frequencies, an even better and more extensive service could have been provided years ago. Restrictions on the power of private stations still exist and all clear channel frequencies are reserved for CBC. The advent of the CBC and its complete monopoly over network broadcasting placed other important curtailments on service to Maritime listeners by prohibiting formation of private station regional networks on a permanent basis.

"We have long felt that the CBC's control of its own destiny, along with that of the private stations, has been a poor compromise to a situation which, in our opinion, never merited the alarm with which it was viewed by some segments of the population and some of our

politicians.

"There is substantial and conclusive evidence in the pre CBC era to substantiate the claim that broadcasting, operating independent of control and regulation, provided a most satisfactory and acceptable service to the people of Canada. It is still our opinion that there should be in the broadcasting industry, as in other forms of publication, an absolute minimum of interference and control. If the majority of broadcasters and the Parliament of Canada feel that some form of regulation should be applied to our industry, then we could offer our complete endorsement of the CARTB brief which recommends the setting up of a telecommunications board completely independent of the CBC and having authority over both the state-owned and privately-owned broadcasting industry.

"The argument which has been used by those favouring the present discriminatory system of control has been that only a limited number of broadcasting frequencies exist and therefore the operation of a broadcasting station provided the owner with a privilege of public trust. This argument is purely theoretical, in that more frequencies are available for the operation of broadcasting stations in Canada than it will be economically practical to use in the next quarter century or more. As Canada's population grows there are sufficient broadcasting frequencies

available to adequately meet the demand. There can be today no argument that radio broadcasting is not a means or method of publication. There are in fact today considerably more broadcasting stations than daily newspapers, and the ceasing of publication of some newspapers and the continuing construction of new broadcasting stations each year should be ample proof of public acceptance of the form known as Electronic Publication.

"Most available evidence indicates that the public of Canada is becoming increasingly dependent on the radio and television broadcasting stations of this country as the major means of mass communication. In the news broadcasting field alone the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of broadcast publication and we, therefore, feel that the rapidly growing predominance of radio and television makes it imperative that broadcasting in both forms have freedom and independence to operate within the framework of the laws of Canada as have all other forms of publication.

"As the financing of the state-owned system is of major concern to the Commission, we would respectfully submit the following observations and suggestions based largely on our experience as a basic network station since the inception of the CBC.

"The present system is, in our opinion, cumbersome and expensive employing far more equipment and people than are actually required

for the service provided. Wastage occurs from the duplication of programmes already offered by the private stations and from the production of many hours of programmes each day which are fed over a national network but largely carried by CBC outlets only. Let us say for example that, in the words of the industry, a 'morning show' is considered a requisite for all stations. Stations, if they are to maintain their individuality, will not carry a network morning show for obvious reasons. The private stations will carry local news, time checks, weather forecasts, morning devotions, and so forth, of special interest to the communities they serve. CBC recorded shows, carried largely on the Corporation's regional networks, are again examples of extravagance, inasmuch as they are but duplication of private station programmes and serve, in most instances, to supply only the Corporation's outlets.

"We are convinced, through our long association with CBC's network programming and policies, that countless hours of unnecessary programming have been provided to justify, or so it would seem, the Corporation's position of being the sole source of network programming. This, we feel, has contributed in large measure to the annual operating costs of the CBC and played no small part in its recurring deficits. A minimum number of hours of CBC programmes is carried by CFNB; the station selecting with care

those network programmes found desirable. In addition, CFNB carries a number of commercial network programmes and devotes the prescribed number of hours to CBC reserved time programmes which are arbitrarily set by the Corporation. Approximately thirty-one per cent of CFNB's weekly broadcast time is comprised of CBC network service or thirty-nine hours out of a total operating weekly figure of one hundred and twenty-three hours.

"It is not to the financial advantage of the station to accept network commercial programmes. The net financial return is small and does not in fact cover CFNB's per hour cost of operation.

It is our studied opinion that the CBC's present concept of its responsibilities is far removed from what we feel the Corporation was originally set up to provide. The CBC today has largely devoted itself to building up an expensive chain of radio and television broadcasting stations and auxiliary facilities, concentrated in the larger centres where the bulk of all CBC programmes originate. For example, in television the CBC has established all of its stations in major centres of population where private companies could have readily provided the necessary stations at no expense to the taxpayer. The less lucrative areas have been left to private interests who, through their own skill and ingenuity, must strive to the utmost to

keep their operations on a reasonably sound financial basis. If television is to succeed in Canada, as it surely will, it will be due to the efforts of those individuals in the smaller centres who have risked their capital. The CBC has done little for television other than to retain for itself exclusively the large and lucrative centres. This pattern is similar to that followed in the development of sound broadcasting in this country.

"We are convinced that large sums of money could have been saved had CBC allowed private interests to develop television, with the Corporation acting as a programme body as we believe was intended; thus supplying the connecting facilities and programmes required for national service. The present ten and one-half hours of national TV programmes per week could have been distributed by the private outlets much less expensively than under the present set-up.

"As we have stated, in sound broadcasting as in television, there is no need for the CBC to own and operate expensive transmitting stations largely duplicating the coverage of the private stations and for many hours a day broadcasting programmes either identical or similar to those provided by these stations. If the CBC would concentrate its resources and talent on the production of fewer programmes of better quality, complementing rather than duplicating private

private station programmes, distribution for such programmes could be arranged over private outlets, providing full national coverage at far less cost than is now the case. It seems logical to assume that there will always be a demand for the kind of cultural, educational and informative programmes the CBC could produce with Canadian talent, but there would seem to be little reason why it should build, maintain, and programme on an eighteen-hour a day or more basis expensive and elaborate transmitting stations, when private station facilities providing the same coverage could be leased for broadcasting national programmes on a regular basis.

"We are of the opinion that the interests of the Government and citizens of Canada and the CBC would be better served if the Corporation divested itself of its radio and television transmitting facilities and concentrated all its efforts toward producing fewer and better national programmes.

"We have recommended an alternative to the present arbitrary system with which the CBC is empowered. However, regardless of what method may be devised or recommended by the Commission, we feel that there can be no justification for the continuance of the CBC's present monopolistic position.

"Monopolies, whether public or private, are by their very nature restrictive and to allow the

CBC to monopolize network radio and television broadcasting, as well as all television broadcasting in Canada's largest cities, will seriously hamper the full development of the broadcasting art in both its forms, with the result that Canadian citizens will be deprived of the complete service to which they are entitled. If the CBC is providing an acceptable standard of programme service then it need have no fear of competition.

"In the matter of licensing, we do not feel that the present system is in the best interests of the stations or their advertisers. Our objections are two in number.

"1 That the monies collected for license fees are not retained by the collecting body, the Department of Transport, but are turned over in their entirety to the CBC. If license fees, at the present rate, are to be collected then it is our opinion that this money should be retained by the Department of Transport to be used for technical advancement in the field of radio and television broadcasting.

"2. We do not object to being licensed, but do feel that the present method of assessment goes far beyond what we term reasonable and just. A broadcasting station's revenue is derived almost completely from the sale of advertising. The present method constitutes a tax on advertising. The recent budget of Finance Minister Harris clearly pointed out the Government's

intention of taxing advertising carried in Canadian printed editions of American publications. Strong condemnation of the Finance Minister's proposal to tax advertising has come from all over Canada and the United States.

"We would like to recommend to the Commission that consideration be given to the institution of a nominal annual license fee to be applied equally to all stations.

"Ever since broadcasting got well under way in Canada, a certain vocal minority of our population has been spreading the gospel of fear that without a strong and all-powerful state-owned broadcasting system Canadian broadcasting would be overrun with programmes having their origin in the United States and that our Canadian culture would eventually be dominated by that of the United States. It is our opinion that regardless of the system of broadcasting, this threat does not exist. Private broadcasters are every bit as loyal citizens as those in public service and are just as anxious to preserve our national identity. Apart from this, the amount of United States broadcasting service imported into Canada is largely determined by the tastes and demands of the listeners and viewers. For reasons of economics as well as public taste, the CBC has always found it necessary to draw reasonably heavily on United States networks for both radio and television programmes. It stands to reason

that a wealthier country with ten times our population will produce many programmes of an outstanding nature which Canadians will want to hear and see, and unless cognizance is taken of this fact Canadians will turn to United States stations for their radio and television programmes.

"In the preceding paragraphs we have outlined our thinking with regard to the status of the broadcasting and telecasting industry. We have attempted to convey to you our solutions in whole or in part to these problems which confront us and in which we are vitally interested. It is with no small degree of pride that we point to our record of some thirty-three years of service to the people of Fredericton and adjoining and outlying communities. We are confident of the future of Canada, of the community we serve, and of the vital role broadcasting can and will play in its continued growth.

"We hope that our observations will be of some assistance to you in carrying out your challenging responsibility, and that your report will endorse the principles of democratic freedom of enterprise and freedom of expression on which our Canadian society was founded."

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I might have Mr. Fenety present our Public Service brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think it is better to go right on and have the supplement presented at the same time as the main brief.

MR. FENETY: "Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: We find it difficult indeed to present, in an unbiased fashion, an outline of our contributions in the Public Service field. The greater part of each broadcasting day is largely devoted to public service broadcasting -- though in the true sense of the word much of this would be considered by the listener as broadcasting of a different type. In the field of public service, we would first like to mention our News Service which, we feel, makes a valuable contribution in the field of education and enlightenment."

THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to understand this, is your news service sponsored or not sponsored?

MR. FENETY: Do you mean the individual newscasts?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FENETY: Some are and some are not, I would think it would run sixty per cent sponsored and forty per cent sustaining.

"Radio Press Limited is owned jointly by Radio Stations CKCW, Moncton; CFBC, Saint John, and CFNB, Fredericton. This is a co-operative news gathering agency, set up exclusively for radio and operated at a financial loss by its owners. We long ago found out that the gathering, processing and broadcasting of news was an expensive proposition and would seldom, if ever, be considered a profit-making

venture. The rapid development of radio stations and the decline in the number of daily newspapers is ample proof of the fact that the broadcasting industry has amply fulfilled its responsibility in the gathering and broadcasting of news. We feel that we have lived up to the responsibilities thrust upon any news gathering agency and have always devoted ourselves to the broadcasting of news considered of prime public interest and importance with a full check rein on the less desitable types of news which properly could be called the sensational variety. This is a tremendous day in and day out responsibility for which the station has assumed full care and control. CFNB broadcasts an average of fourteen newscasts of varying lengths per day and maintains a staff of three trained, competent, responsible newsmen in its News Room.

"As an additional service to the listener, CFNB's Radio Press News Editor, Larry Knowles, presents thrice weekly commentaries on significant news happenings which are designed to bring CFNB listeners more detailed information on these important news happenings. If the station were fortunate enough to sell all its newscasts on a commercial basis, the full cost of the news service would still not be realized. Worthy of mention here is the fact that CFNB's News Room co-operates to the fullest extent with all public spirited organizations and

successfully cooperates with all law enforcement agencies for the common good.

"Turning to direct public service contributions, CFNB's contributions in the field of direct public service through assistance to organizations seeking support, financial or otherwise, is of inestimable value to these groups. Scarcely a day goes by that CFNB does not devote time to the encouragement of some worthwhile community endeavour. For your information, we attach a random sampling of 'thank you letters' from various groups and organizations. On reading these, you will have a better idea of the part played by the station in the successful fulfillment of the aims and objectives of these groups. We are not prepared to say, for example, that the Red Cross free blood transfusion service would not be a success without CFNB's contribution, but we are of the opinion that our part in this success has been a substantial one. We should perhaps point out here that token payments are accepted from a small fraction of the groups using CFNB's facilities for financial appeals. Token payments are made to the station by such organizations as Canadian Red Cross, Canadian Cancer Society, Saint Johns Ambulance, Salvation Army Red Shield, and possibly a few others operating on a national basis. Additionally,

in cases where token payments are received by the station, similar amounts are paid to the newspapers. The largest amount received for any national campaign is $150.00 and the organization contributing this amount receives many times this amount in complimentary advertising over the one month campaign period.

"We should now point out that the foregoing are the exception rather than the rule and the bulk of all campaigns aired on the station is aired on a wholly gratis basis. We feel quite safe in saying that CFNB's contributions to public service is unmatched in any field. Many of these campaigns require a good deal of time and effort on the part of the station and again the station provides freely of its facilities.

"In financial campaigns alone, we would have no way of estimating the stations' part in their success but we would feel safe in saying that many thousands of dollars could be directly attributed to our efforts. CFNB's station time contribution would be in excess of $50,000.00 annually and this, we feel, is a very conservative estimate. No community endeavour in the public interest has failed for lack of support from CFNB. Though many of these campaigns are conducted at times inconvenient to the station, the station and its personnel are none the less generous in their support and enthusiasm. What

is good for the community we serve is good for us.

"As mentioned earlier, it is perhaps easier for station personnel to define public service broadcasting than for the listener. Even though a broadcast may be sponsored, it may rightly be considered a public service. Through the station our listeners are kept abreast of the events and happenings taking place in our community. In this category would be broadcasts such as description and opening of the new Lady Beaverbrook Rink, the I.O.D.E's Provincial Convention, the Fredericton Exhibition, Military Parades at Camp Gagetown, Sports Broadcasts, Music Festivals, Remembrance Day Services, and a host of others. Most broadcasts of this type involve additional expenses to the station and in only a few instances are the costs recovered through commercial sponsorship. In fact, we could safely say that less than ten per cent of the overall cost is ever recovered by the station.

"In the field of religious broadcasting, which we again include under public service, many programme hours are devoted weekly to this classification with the bulk of it provided on a gratis basis. Daily devotional periods, weekly church service broadcasts, along with other religious broadcasting, make up one

of the largest time segments of our broadcasting week.

"In specialized programme categories, aside from music, religious broadcasting is exceeded only by news broadcasts and talks and discussions on public affairs. Of seven hours religious broadcasting carried per week by the station, only one hour and fifty five minutes is of a commercial nature and these programmes are sponsored by the churches or religious groups. The station provides in excess of $15,000 worth of free time for religious broadcasting annually.

"In the field of talks and public discussions, several hundred programmes of this type are aired annually covering a wide range of local subjects and bringing to our listeners the views and opinions of many of the city's outstanding visitors. Here again the station derives no revenue from broadcasts of this type.

"A noteworthy talks programme is CFNB's Teen Age Book Parade which has received wide acclaim and acceptance from groups and individuals at widely separated points in the Province.

"CFNB's Report From Parliament Hill is an unique service organized by CFNB and many other private stations to bring a non-political report on happenings in Parliament of local and

national interest by members of Parliament to their constituents. Commenting on this, Hon. Milton F. Gregg says:

> "'As far as my own section of New Brunswick is concerned, I can tell you immediately that your reports are very much appreciated and there is a steadily increasing number of listeners in York-Sunbury that do really appreciate this service given by the private broadcasting stations in Canada.'

"Additionally, CFNB presents in this series reports by leading commentators, members of the Ottawa Press Gallery, members of the diplomatic corps, prominent visiting statesmen and others. This latter series is presented by CFNB at considerable expense in an effort to create a greater interest in and a more informed knowledge of public affairs and is duplicated by only four other broadcasting stations in Canada.

"Also worthy of mention under public service programmes would be the Annual Rotary Radio Auction which, over the years, has been almost the sole means of fund raising for the Rotary Club with the broadcast provided by CFNB on a public service basis.

"It should be kept in mind that many campaigns and broadcasts are promoted in CFNB's newscasts, which publicity would be over and

above that already mentioned. This compares to mention in the regular news columns of a newspaper. Spot announcements are equivalent to newspaper advertising and talks and interviews can be compared to special feature articles in a newspaper. The combination of spot announcements, talks and interviews with which the station usually supports community projects is therefore very complete.

"There are many out of town broadcasts originated and carried by the station on a public service broadcast basis for listeners in the communities we serve. For example, the Music Festival of St. Stephen and Woodstock; Woodstock's Old Home Week Celebrations, the Dedication of a Tree Farm at Stanley, Convention at St. Andrews, Progress Reports from Camp Gagetown, and others. Needless to say, out of studio and out of town broadcasts, of which there are many in the run of a year, are considerably more expensive than in studio broadcasts but again they are largely, almost wholly, of a public service non-commercial nature.

"Turning to school broadcasts, certainly education is in the public service field and we feel that some mention should be made of it in any review of our public service broadcasting. In the present school broadcast year, CFNB has originated two quarter-hour broadcasts weekly

in the period October-April inclusive. In originating two of these programmes the station makes available its technical personnel and facilities. This includes the use of studios, equipment, time for rehearsals, timing, production and announcer personnel. A conservative estimate would place the value of this service in any one broadcasting year at $5,000, excluding the cost of recording which is partially borne by the CBC School Broadcast Department. It would perhaps be fair to ask if any other private business in New Brunswick, aside from broadcasting stations, makes a contribution of this magnitude to education.

"In conclusion, it could be argued that CFNB carries many of these broadcasts for the purpose of attracting listeners but if this argument is followed to its natural conclusion, then one must assume that CFNB, having the greatest number of listeners of any New Brunswick station, must provide an acceptable standard of broadcasting of both a public service and commercial nature. It should be kept in mind too that not all of these broadcasts are directed to a majority audience -- the station keeping in mind its responsibilities to all tastes and groups however large or small.

"We feel that CFNB has made a valuable contribution to the economic progress of the

communities we serve. The station employs twenty-eight people on a full-time basis and it should be noted that the vast majority of these are residents of the city, many of them with families and all of them actively engaged in various facets of community life.

"In the field of commerce, CFNB has played an important role in the development of retail trade Fredericton merchants and our wide rural coverage has served to expand extensively the Fredericton trading area. Our provincial listeners are hearing constantly of the wide variety of merchandise offered by Fredericton retail stores and when you consider the number of years that CFNB has provided this service some appreciation can be realized of our contribution to the business life of this community. CFNB is the only advertising medium that reaches people in all walks of life throughout our province. We would like to stress that although our first interest is, and will always be, the citizens of the City of Fredericton, we have a large audience in the Maritime Provinces. To illustrate, Fredericton has just under 5,000 homes while by independent survey CFNB's regular audience, exclusive of the State of Maine, has been measured at better than 80,000 homes. Naturally, therefore, our programming must be designed to serve this large audience.

"While this does not attempt to be a

complete report, we do feel that it will serve to assist the Commission in assessing the value of Public Service rendered by CFNB to the various organizations and groups in Central New Brunswick and to its listeners."

That concludes the supplement, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fenety. Now we will have the questions, and I would like you to feel free to ask anyone on your staff to answer any questions.

MR. NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: I think the principal point you make in your brief is that the CBC should not be in the station operating business but should concentrade on producing programmes for distribution through private outlets?

MR. NEILL: That is correct, yes.

MR. COYNE: Now, you deal with that more in the latter part of your brief but before asking you some questions about that there are a few matters in the more introductory part that I would like to deal with first. At the top of page 2 you are speaking of the services by the private stations to the Maritimes before the establishment of CBC stations and you say:

> " . . . and in the main CBC stations of the Maritimes are today serving the identical areas covered by the private stations, and to a

considerable extent duplicating the programme service provided by these stations."

Would you explain what you mean by saying "duplicating the programme service"?

MR. NEILL: I mean they are producing programmes in the day time to be fed to the network which are the same type of popular appeal programmes which the private broadcasters are supplying. It is my impression that the service they provide should be more a minority programme schedule to take care of the people who do not particularly care for the popular fare; they should be music programmes of light concert music, talks and features to a more select audience other than the general audience which is being served by the private stations. They can or should provide, in my submission, specialized services and that is my impression of what the CBC was originally set up to do, to provide a service which would not, it was felt, be too well covered by the private broadcasting stations.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you are assuming that the content of their programmes is too much along the same lines to that which is being presented by the private stations?

MR. NEILL: That is correct, just keeping or following the private stations, in order to get the audience.

MR. COYNE: Well, then ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you leaving that now?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I am leaving that aspect of it; perhaps if you have a question you might put it now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it seems to me what you are saying is somewhat more than what you have now explained. You say:

> ". . . and to a considerable extent duplicating the programme service provided by these stations."

Then on page 5 you say, near the top of the page:

> ". . . inasmuch as they are but duplication of private stations programmes and serve, in most instances, to supply only the Corporation's outlets."

And then:

> " . . . countless hours of unnecessary programming . . ."

And I am looking for another place here where you talk of -- oh, yes, page 7 you say:

> "As we have stated, in sound broadcasting as in television, there is no need for the CBC to own and operate expensive transmitting stations largely duplicating the coverage of the private stations and for many hours a day broadcasting programmes either identical or similar to those provided by these stations."

Well now, what orchestral music do you carry on your station?

MR. NEILL: We carry a number of hours a week of orchestral music -- are you thinking of concert music?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. NEILL: In the concert field we have a one hour programme of our own particularly that I would cite, "My Concert Album", produced by our programme director which has a large following in this area. We broadcast the symphony on Sunday afternoon; we have the Pop Concert on Friday night; we carry the CBC Wednesday Night series ---

THE CHAIRMAN: These orchestras you are talking about are all records, are they?

MR. NEILL: Yes, they are because we do not have concert orchestras in Fredericton which we can use. We do have a symphony orchestra here but one or two concerts a year are about all amateur musicians are able to provide.

MR. FENETY: The reference there, Mr. Chairman, would be to music from the shows, Rodgers and Hammerstein and so on and so forth, that fill in great periods of the day; they are recordings of the light or popular nature and they certainly are duplicating the type of programme provided by the private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say the CBC is doing this?

MR. FENETY: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are one of the basic stations of the Trans-Canada Network and what proportion of your broadcasting time is taken up by CBC programmes that you carry?

MR. NEILL: That is in the brief, thirty-one ---

MR. FENETY: Thirty-nine hours and thirty minutes per week is devoted to network programming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you have any regional panel discussions on your private station here?

MR. FENETY: Not on a regular basis. We do carry panel discussions from time to time, the most recent series we conducted in co-operation with the Junior Chamber of Commerce and we touched on such subjects as flood control on the Saint John River; the introduction of fluoridation to the City water supply and things of that nature. We do carry broadcasts of that type from time to time.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have heard a lot about farm programmes, have you a farm programme on your station?

MR. FENETY: We have no farm programme as such at the moment and we have given considerable thought to opening up a farm department for the station and this, I believe, will come into being within the next six months or so.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have no farm programme similar to the ones we heard about in Charlottetown and Halifax?

MR. FENETY: The last farm programme we carried on a regular basis was about a year and a half ago carried in conjunction with the New Brunswick Department of Agriculture which was a half hour programme once a week. It was a forum type of discussion on farm affairs and I can quite safely tell you that the reason the programme is not on the air now was because the farm groups and the members of the Department of Agriculture found it was a little too much work for them to prepare a programme of this nature. However, the facilities are still available to those groups and whenever they are prepared to use them we are prepared to offer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be the reason but it means that the farmers of this community are not through your station getting farm service at the moment.

MR. FENETY: We do provide all the necessary farm news, pest control or things like that, working in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your news broadcast?

MR. FENETY: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Would the farm broadcast of the CBC be available to you, the twelve o'clock news Monday through Friday?

MR. FENETY: It is available to us, yes. That is a special consideration on our part, the fact that we do not carry the farm broadcast; it

comes at 12.15 which is a very awkward time period for our station. We have many times expressed a desire to carry the CBC farm broadcast in the noon hour if the Corporation would relieve us of two or more of the daily commercial soap operas which go on down here in the noon hour. That is a situation I feel is common only to the Maritime Provinces and very few stations at that. We have tremendous commercial soap serials: from 11.45 to 12.00; another from 12.00 to 12.15; another from 12.45 to 1.00; another from 1.15 to 1.30 and another from 1.30 to 1.45.

MR. COYNE: Are these all national network programmes?

MR. NEILL: National or regional.

MR. FENETY: National network programmes, which leave us the period from 12.15 to 12.45 for our own news and the noon hour is a highly desirable commercial time and if we are going to have a news broadcast at noon we must fill the rest of the half hour that is open.

MR. COYNE: Explain this to me, would you, how can the Maritime farm broadcast be coming over the Trans-Canada network from 12.15 to 12.45?

MR. FENETY: It is in the half hour period.

MR. COYNE: Between soap operas?

MR. FENETY: That is right, we are at a distinct disadvantage there.

MR. COYNE: Why would it make any difference, if there are not soap operas through that half

hour period, for you to be relieved of the soap operas at another period, an adjoining period?

MR. FENETY: I do not get your question.

MR. COYNE: I think you have said you have discussed carrying on the farm broadcast from 12.15 to 12.45 but you say you can only do that if you are relieved of network soap operas at other times?

MR. FENETY: That is right. We carry a fifteen-minute newscast from 12.30 to 12.45, and if we are to have a feature length newscast in the noon hour we must be relieved of the soap opera from 12.15 to 12.30 or 12.30 to 12.45. We are hemmed in on all sides.

MR. COYNE: This is an economic consideration in the sense the network soap operas are not particularly revenue producing for you; is that right?

MR. FENETY: They are not revenue producers for us, that is, we get less than our cost of carrying it but we, as I say, would carry the farm broadcasts. We have made it clear to the Farmers' Federation and so on, if we have some time to ourselves in the noon hour and, as I pointed out a moment ago, the noon hour periods are highly desirable commercial periods and today with the advent of television and the reduced revenue from night-time operations, the private stations are forced more and more to derive their revenue from the day-time hours ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, may I interrupt? Why

would this situation apply in Fredericton when apparently the private stations in Halifax and Charlottetown, and perhaps other parts of the province, seem to be able to carry farm broadcasts? We have had a lot of evidence from the farmers of how valuable it is.

MR. NEILL: The station in Halifax -- it is carried on the CBC owned station; the station in Charlottetown is a Dominion station. The matter of the soap operas in the noon hour has been a constant source of irritation to us. Since I have had CFNB, for the past ten years, I have been petitioning the CBC to clear up this situation which is not a desirable situation in a community such as this. The men here, the majority of them, come home to lunch and they do not wish to listen to the soap operas; they have an audience of women but not men. This situation has been brought to the attention of the CBC constantly until now I have pretty well given up and I can get no action whatsoever. The fact they are recorded in Montreal and fed down here to us makes the situation even more ludicrous, there being nothing more than the sponsors' demands for these programmes being scheduled in the noon hour. We used to have CBC programme network meetings at which we could bring these matters to the attention of the CBC, but we have not had one for four years.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not going to get into the detailed matter of programming and shifting of hours. What I was interested in was the general

charge you are making that the programmes that are being put out by the CBC are either identical or similar to those provided by private stations,and it seems to run through your brief. It may be that all we can do -- we are having a fairly extensive programme analysis made and that may be a better way to get at the analysis of programmes than for us to be going into detail about it. I must say I was surprised that you would go so far as suggesting identical or similar nature of programmes because the whole evidence we have had so far was rather the other way, that the overall content of the CBC programming was very different indeed from the content of the private station programmes. We have had a number of private stations say this is natural and inescapable and it may well be but never has there been a suggestion, as I recall, that a programme of the CBC, taken as a whole, was merely a duplication of the private station programmes.

MR. NEILL: We are inclined to look at this from the point of view of the big programmes at night time; we are pointing out that the CBC operates in the day as well and it is these day-time programmes in the main that we consider are the duplication.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not too clear from your brief but it seems to me that your general attitude on this point can be summarized by saying that the CBC is wasting money because it is duplicating or substantially duplicating programmes of

the private stations. If you are saying that, you cannot just take a piece of the programming, you have to take the whole thing and if you take the whole overall programming of the CBC and the overall full programming of private stations, which I think would be the only fair comparison, is that not a totally different thing?

MR. NEILL: I do not think you will find it so when you have the results of your studies.

MR. COYNE: I take it, Mr. Neill, that one of your suggestions in your brief, in any event, is that the CBC should not have an overall programming in the sense of an eighteen hours a day programming operation?

MR. NEILL: That is correct, that is our opinion.

MR.COYNE: On page 2 in the second paragraph in the middle of the page you say:

> "The advent of the CBC and its complete monopoly over network broadcasting placed other important curtailments on service to Maritime listeners by prohibiting formation of private station regional networks on a permanent basis."

How does this regulation on private station networks involve a curtailment of service to the listeners?

MR. NEILL: The Maritime stations, either New Brunswick or all province stations,should pool

their resources and ability and turn to producing large programmes of a wider appeal or using network presentations, spreading the costs over a number of stations and we can produce bigger and better programmes. We are not allowed to do that except on an occasional basis. In the commercial field there would be many advantages to running a network of Fredericton and Saint John and probably including Campbellton and Newcastle,which would give us a coverage of the province.

MR. COYNE: Do you have any difficulty in arranging a hook-up through the CBC when you want to?

MR. NEILL: The system is expensive and cumbersome; each and every programme series must have the approval of the CBC. All the contractual arrangements, if it is a sponsored programme, must be made by the CBC's commercial department. It is a very cumbersome system. The contracts are all handled -- payments we receive we turn over to the CBC and they turn them back to us. It is a very cumbersome system. Additionally we are required to buy the network lines from the CBC; we cannot buy on the open market, we must pay their price, we cannot buy them freely and this gets to be very expensive. We could make our own arrangements with the wire companies, we feel, at a much more reasonable rate than we obtain them through the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: That still does not quite indicate that it is an overall curtailment of service

to the Maritime listeners. What makes you think that you would give more service rather than less service, that a local network such as you suggest, three, four or five stations, would be able to provide more than what is now on almost a national basis -- you are talking about curtailment of service to listeners?

MR. NEILL: That is right, the listeners are not getting the advantage of the service we could provide if we were free to. We are not free to set up networks and we cannot provide the service.

THE CHAIRMAN: They are getting some services at the moment which you would not be providing if you had the network taking up the hours?

MR. NEILL: Not at all. I merely pointed out the programmes could be more extensive and larger and better productions if the cost of those programmes was spread over a group of stations rather than having to be borne by one individual station. Also, you could draw on the talent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can understand the argument if you were able to have the regional network you could have a more extensive programming yourself, call on more talent locally yourselves and presumably sell more commercially yourself. You would offer a better product from a business point of view which would be a good thing for you. The point you are making though is not that; you are talking about important curtailments of service to Maritime listeners.

MR. NEILL: Well, this service is being curtailed, it is being prohibited. This service I say we can offer is being curtailed, it is not allowed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Something has to happen on these hours and if you take over a network basis something would have to come off.

MR. NEILL: We are providing a service but I am suggesting that through the use of networks we could provide a better service and it is this overall service that is not being allowed, we cannot provide the regional service which we otherwise would be able to if we were not curtailed. The people who are suffering are the listeners; they could have more and better radio fare or should we say more radio fare of a better kind if it were not for this curtailment. This would not interfere with CBC at all but would add to the CBC services, more service for the listener.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you mentioned the CBC Wednesday Night which we have heard a lot about as being a generally good programme provided by the CBC, and many people have said they liked it. Would your regional network be able to replace the CBC Wednesday Night?

MR. NEILL: I do not say that we could on a regional basis produce the same quality of programme in certain categories that can be produced nationally, no. Nor am I suggesting that our network service I am talking about would replace the CBC Wednesday

Night. There are many hours of the day we could programme without interfering with the service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if this is the case is it not clear that whatever network service you have locally would have to be subject to some kind of approval in programming to fit in with the overall national programming? You could not give it an absolute, wide-open freedom, could you?

MR. NEILL: No, it is all a matter of arrangement, contract and agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does it come down to anything more than the fact that you are really protesting about the cumbersome nature of the arrangement to get a regional network?

MR. NEILL: Yes, because it excludes, to all practical purposes, network broadcast.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the quality,with a regional network type of thing either on a continuing or a one-shot basis, is still going to be subject, in your view, or need to be subject to over-all control?

MR. NEILL: Overall control from only the people producing that, not from any central authority.

THE CHAIRMAN: How are you going to stop interfering with the Wednesday Night programme?

MR. NEILL: If the CBC programme is such and it is desirable for us to carry it, we will carry it,but we will supplement that with our own programming in times which are outside of that service.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point I am putting to you is, take this situation; you have to do a CBC Wednesday Night program?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are proposing a regional network right to stations and I am asking, do you propose that that should be absolutely free at the choice of the station to put it in anywhere it likes during the day or should it be subject to some over-all control by CBC or somebody else?

MR. NEILL: No, I think it should be free the same as we are free to programme today. Now, if the CBC has certain contracts, that is, for network services or certain arrangements themselves for particular and specific network programmes why naturally that arrangement has to be given consideration as well. I am not suggesting we ride roughshod over the national service, that we have an agreement with the CBC to carry-- I am suggesting a desire to eliminate CBC services and putting in our own. That is not the suggestion that comes from this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did not think it was but let us take a specific example; the CBC Wednesday Night programme, should your regional network that you are proposing be able to exclude the CBC Wednesday Night programme if you wanted to?

MR. NEILL: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what I thought

you were saying at first but I wondered for a while.

MR. NEILL: I was not endeavouring to be evasive.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do I understand, Mr. Neill, if a regional network is arranged that the arrangement must be made through CBC?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That they collect either directly or through the originating station all the advertising fees that eventuate from that network and then they proportion back to the participating station that advertising fee?

MR. NEILL: That is correct, that is the system presently in existence and it is very, very cumbersome as I am sure you will appreciate.

MR. COYNE: In this discussion of networks you say on page 6:

> "It is not to the financial advantage of the station to accept network commercial programmes. The net financial return is small and does not in fact cover CFNB's per hour cost of operation."

Now, you are speaking there of national networks?

MR. NEILL: Of national commercial networks, yes.

MR. COYNE: I suppose that situation would apply to any national radio network, it is not anything peculiar to a network run by the CBC, is it?

MR. NEILL: Yes, I think it is.

MR. COYNE: In what sense?

MR. NEILL: Well, in the sense that the CBC is not set up to operate a proper commercial network.

MR. COYNE: In what sense "proper"?

MR. NEILL: In the first place they have no sales department; they do not do any selling, they wait until people come to them to buy. They have never had a sales department, they have never promoted sales of broadcasting, they only hinder it because they operate it without advertising it. All the rates are set by the CBC, not by the private stations, and they are set by the CBC in handling commercial programmes.

MR. COYNE: But surely the rates are set on the basis of station or network audience, are they not? I mean, they are not designed to give away something to the advertiser, are they?

MR. NEILL: Yes, they are designed -- it is an easier way to get business to set the rate than to go out and get a higher rate and have to sell. It is the system used by the CBC.

MR. COYNE: What you are saying is that the CBC does not charge the advertiser enough for the network?

MR. NEILL: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: And in your opinion they could charge more?

MR. NEILL: I am sure they could charge more and I am complaining too that the rates for the individual private stations are not set by the stations but by the network. I mean, the rate for CFNB, for instance, is not set by us but set by the CBC and it is a lower rate than the rate we charge anybody else. On top of that, the CBC takes fifty per cent of the gross return after deducting certain discounts and we get what is left. Now, our rate is, I think, $60 an hour for daytime and of that on a soap programme our net return in this noon hour we are speaking of is $4.30, give or take a few cents.

MR. COYNE: Surely this is a feature of network operation. You speak of fifty per cent going to pay the costs; that has nothing to do with whether it is a publicly operated network or a privately operated network, has it? Surely in the United States the station rates are fixed by the network. They may be fixed initially by agreement in the sense the station does not have to go on the network if it does not choose to accept the rates. Surely there is nothing peculiar about the CBC network organization that distinguishes it from a private commercial network, except possibly your point about aggressiveness in the sales department?

MR. NEILL: The rate in the United States is set by agreement, not arbitrarily; they are free to accept or reject. There are alternate networks; if you don't like the arrangement offered by one you can -- there is a strong possibility you can get another one, but here in Canada you have nothing but monopoly.

MR. FENETY: May I suggest that it is not a realistic figure that we are granted by the CBC for network broadcasts, inasmuch as it is not based on the audience of the station. Let me tell you for example: a station with a lower number of radio homes in the Bureau of Broadcast Measurement survey can get a higher rate than can CFNB.

MR. COYNE: What is it based on -- or do you know?

MR. FENETY: I don't know but I have my own ideas on that, that there are stations lower in number of homes served who receive a higher rate.

MR. COYNE: Is that statistic as to the number of homes served universally accepted?

MR. FENETY: I think it is, yes, and you will find in the United States it is based on the market; the net return to the station is based on the market.

MR. NEILL: The system established in the BBM until a year ago was subscribed to by the CBC. They have since dropped it, but they must have had confidence in it because they subscribed to it and supported it.

MR. COYNE: On your principal point you say -- and I am looking at page 7 of your brief, at the top, and perhaps I am paraphrasing your general point -- that the CBC should not have radio and television stations of its own, but should be a programming body distributing programmes to the private station outlets?

MR. NEILL: That is correct; that is our opinion.

MR. COYNE: And you advocate this partially as a means of reducing the cost of the CBC?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: But you do say that they would be left with supplying the connecting facilities and programmes required for national service. Surely

the two items of connecting facilities and programmes are by far the largest items of expense in the CBC budget?

MR. NEILL: CBC is, I believe, operating some twenty-one stations in the radio field and I am sure, knowing something of the cost of operating a radio station, that the cost of the operation of those stations is high.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is not a net cost; they are getting some revenue. If you are making a profit, I presume they could?

MR. NEILL: I don't think so, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: They may not be, but they could?

MR. NEILL: Not and be operated the way they are today. I am not casting any reflection on the staff, but by their pattern of operation they could not be operating at a profit.

MR. COYNE: Supposing you had this situation, how do you arrange for this distribution of programmes over private outlets? I suppose there are two ways you can do it; one, by agreement, and the other by compulsion, and I rather gather from an answer of yours to the Chairman a moment ago that you contemplate it would be by agreement, because you said if the regional arrangements interfered with some national programmes it should be a matter of your own choice. On that basis how do you ensure any distribution for any CBC programmes at all?

MR. NEILL: You buy the time on the private station, I can see no reason why the private stations should give time free. The CBC will buy time on the network lines and it will buy the co-axial cable to distribute its programmes. Nobody has ever suggested that the Bell Telephone Company should give free time on the co-axial cable.

MR. COYNE: You are speaking of trying to cut down the costs of operating the CBC and now, if I understand you, they are left with the cost of producing the programmes, which is the largest single item, and they are left with the connecting facilities, which in television is also large, and they are also going out to buy time?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And I also take it they are not going to have any advertising revenue?

MR. NEILL: We are suggesting in our brief that the time devoted to this service be very much restricted over what it is today. We are suggesting four or five hours a day on truly national programmes, and the rest of the time the network is free -- the expense for the network facilities is washed out.

MR. COYNE: That is, they would only be producing a very small proportion of the programming they are producing today?

MR. NEILL: That is right. It is our opinion that a lot of their programming is wasted, that it is terminated at the control panel of the stations and never goes on the air.

MR. COYNE: What is wasted, surely, is the outlet into the various network affiliates that don't use it? It is not wasted if it is put out over the private station?

MR. NEILL: If you produce a programme for sixty stations and only twelve carry it, I suggest it is an economic waste.

THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the twelve stations covered the whole country?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not necessarily a count-of-noses operation?

MR. NEILL: Well, it is in a sense because even though the twelve stations covered the whole country, the audience is specifically divided. It would depend on the audience those twelve stations would be able to control. It has always been shown by independent surveys that the CBC stations do not have the same audience; they do not have the same appeal as the commercial stations.

MR. COYNE: Supposing under these arrangements, the CBC could not persuade anybody to carry their programmes, do you contemplate that they should have the right, as they have now, to compel these outlets, which they depend upon, to carry these programmes which, after all, are the national service?

MR. NEILL: This is a theoretical agreement. Actually, I can't envisage the CBC not obtaining

distribution if they are willing to pay for the time, and I don't think there is any desire on the part of the private broadcasters to exclude the service, but I feel it should be paid for.

THE CHAIRMAN: What kind of a programme are you thinking of that they should produce -- what sort of programme?

MR. NEILL: Well, they are producing educational programmes, and I think they should be more on adult education than children.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the one we were talking about before; do you think the Wednesday Night programme should be produced?

MR. NEILL: I think it should, yes, because it is of the minority appeal, stimulating to a certain audience which is not satisfied with anything else.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think the Halifax Symphony Orchestra should be produced?

MR. NEILL: I think it is very desirable that it should be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think Meeting the Press, or this panel type of thing, such as Fighting Words, should be produced?

MR. NEILL: I think discussion programmes are important, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And do you think these have an entertainment value as well as an informative value?

MR. NEILL: Most certainly, yes. Some of

them have entertainment and some of them are purely informative. The majority of them have entertainment value.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, why, as a private station should you be paid to carry them when you will go out the next minute and pay your own money to produce a similar programme?

MR. NEILL: Because I feel the CBC requires distribution of its programmes, and it has taken money from the taxpayers to which we are contributing both in our income tax and license fee. I don't think any other Crown Corporations get similar service for nothing. For instance, the Defence Department does not expect to get bombing planes free from the people who produce them because they are an essential public service.

MR. COYNE: What happens in the scheme, as you envisage it, to national network advertising revenue? Is the CBC going to get that?

MR. NEILL: The advertising revenue of the network?

MR. COYNE: Yes -- I am not sure how I understand there would be a network under this.

MR. NEILL: We ask for freedom to establish our own networks.

MR. COYNE: Would the CBC produce no sponsored programmes under this scheme?

MR. NEILL: In my opinion the CBC should not be in the commercial business. I don't think

they should be in the commercial business at all. I think it should be producing programmes from the point of view of the listener it is supposed to serve without consideration of sponsorship.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say that what you really suggest for the CBC is a somewhat similar type of arrangement as we presently have for the National Film Board?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: . . . which I understand to be an organization which produces films, but has no assured methods of distribution beyond what it can persuade the theatre operators to take?

MR. NEILL: Well, I think the policy and set-up of the National Film Board -- I think they should be prepared to pay for the distribution of their programmes in theatres if they can't get it otherwise.

MR. COYNE: What advantage do you think this scheme that you are outlining has to the general public as distinct from the private operators? We have heard a considerable amount of evidence suggesting that a large measure of the CBC network service as presently enjoyed is a good thing. There are a lot of people in this country, apparently, who seem to want it. There are people here in this area -- and we will be hearing from them later -- who want CBC programmes that they are not now receiving.

MR. NEILL: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: Wouldn't it be the inevitable result of your scheme that the scope of operations of the CBC would be very much cut down -- their programme operation?

MR. NEILL: Their programming, but not necessarily their essential programming. Their volume of programmes would be cut down, but not necessarily the programmes to which you are referring which people want particularly to hear.

MR. COYNE: You mean the programmes that would be cut out would be programmes that nobody wanted to hear, anyway?

MR. NEILL: I won't say that nobody wanted to hear. I said earlier they were duplication. I certainly would not suggest nobody wanted to hear them.

MR. COYNE: Referring to my earlier question, how do you envisage this scheme as being in the general public interest, apart from the saving of funds?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it would not save funds.

MR. NEILL: I submit that, in my opinion, it would save funds because you can't produce, even with our inexpensive programmes, for eighteen hours a day without some expense, but if that is reduced to four or five hours a day there is certainly very substantial saving, and if you are paying for the distribution of eighteen hours, then there is substantial reduction if you reduce it to four or five hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are suggesting they pay for station time, which would be on the other side of the ledger.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And getting no revenue from advertising, which again would increase costs. Frankly, I don't see how your suggestion will decrease the cost.

MR. NEILL: Distribution of programmes in radio over a network somewhat larger and more extensive than the Trans-Canada network today, for four hours' time, at the present network rate would be something in the neighbourhood of four million dollars a year or less; it would be in that neighbourhood. Now, what rates would be negotiated for stations on a bulk purchase basis -- for instance, they would purchase six hours, and I think they could expect and be entitled to some kind of bulk arrangement which would be substantially lower than the regular advertising rate. I am not suggesting private stations are endeavouring to get a lot of money out of the CBC. We are doing quite well now, and it is not with that in mind, but if distribution is wanted, rather than on a compulsion basis I think it should be a separate, a contractual arrangement.

THE CHAIRMAN: What about Mr. Coyne's question. Would you repeat the question, Mr.Coyne?

MR. COYNE: I think actually it was answered.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the question was

this: that apart from the question of cost, how do you think the public is going to be better served by your scheme than by the present one?

MR. NEILL: I think the public by building a bigger and stronger private industry, that this will lead to the fact that the public would get a better service, that is, in the more popular wide appeal fields and the CBC producing in the main programmes of a more restrictive nature, restricted as far as audience appeal is concerned, more selective programmes specially designed on a national basis; that they will get a better programme from the CBC, and they will get better service from the private industry. I think this will apply in television as well as radio. We have a strong private television industry across Canada, strong and profitable, and they will provide a very excellent service, and if it is supplemented on a national basis by the CBC increasing the emphasis on quality rather than on quantity, everybody is going to benefit.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you visualize a situation where, if you are able, you could still go out and get a sponsor for one of these CBC programmes that they are going to buy the time for?

MR. NEILL: No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: They would sell it to the CBC instead of selling it to some commercial sponsor.

MR. NEILL: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: But, you see, we have got

to proceed in this inquiry on facts as we can discover them, and one of the points put to us in numerous briefs is that there are quite a number of groups -- and I am speaking of not just two or three, and not to be brushed off as little minorities -- who are speaking in favour of certain kinds of service from the CBC. We have had numerous farm organizations and they want service early in the morning and at noon. We have had various parent and teacher groups who have spoken about the service they want for younger and older children, presumably during daytime hours. We have had representations from, let us say, the large Labour groups who want more adult education of a sort which will probably have to be done in the evening. So that, this sort of "wave of the hand" that you can cut it down to four or five hours is not going to be quite so easy if you have people asking for programmes all through the day.

MR. NEILL: Could we establish this, Mr. Chairman: that not all programmes of the CBC are what we might call good, nor are all the programmes of a private station what we might call good, nor can any one individual station or network satisfy all the people all the time. I think if we go on from there, we can take the time segments and divide them up and supply the Labour groups who want the adult education and the others who want their programmes, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you divide them?

MR. NEILL: You have only so many operating hours a day ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Is everybody going to start dividing them up all over the country, or is there going to be any national effort at all?

MR. NEILL: As I visualize it, sir, this will be a mutual contractual agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: You can't have a contractual agreement between one hundred and fifty-nine people and work out a consistent national programme.

MR. NEILL: If you had ten hours a day and you decided that so many hours would be for such and such a thing on a Tuesday ---

THE CHAIRMAN: But who decides?

MR. NEILL: The participating parties would decide.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is there no national interest in this thing?

MR. NEILL: Well, that is the national interest. This would be an arrangement between the private broadcasters and the controlling body, be it the CBC or some other body.

THE CHAIRMAN: The national interest is the agreement that exists between one hundred and sixty odd people to provide the national service.

MR. COYNE: But some stations in British Columbia may be prepared to provide ten hours a day and some stations in Nova Scotia would do only one hour a day?

MR. NEILL: Which is very much as it is today. The CBC only reserves so many hours a day.

MR. COYNE: Except you are suggesting that under your scheme the CBC stations are not going to exist.

MR. NEILL: Yes, but in other hands.

MR. COYNE: They won't be CBC-operated stations?

MR. NEILL: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it fair to say your proposal is a complete reversal of the history of the CBC and the various Commissions and the twelve or fourteen parliamentary inquiries' conclusions that have taken place since 1929?

MR. NEILL: I don't know if it is safe to say that or not, sir. To a degree perhaps it is, but certainly not essentially. The service provided by the CBC is the important thing; the programmes which they produce, that is the important thing -- that and their distribution. The mechanics is something else again. I think the CBC concentrates too much on transmitting facilities and far too little on programming. I think all their efforts should be on programming.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are suggesting they should concentrate less on programming -- cut it down from sixteen hours a day to six?

MR. NEILL: Less on volume, yes, but more on quality.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get at is that you have to live in a country according to its basic public opinion; I think you would agree with that, and here you have history going back to the Aird report, through all these partliamentary inquiries, which seem to think we ought to have a national broadcasting service and which is in our Act.

MR. NEILL: Yes. Well, I don't disagree with that. I think we can have that national broadcasting service, but I don't think it necessarily requires the use of CBC-owned transmitting facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us leave out the transmitting facilities. Do you believe it needs the CBC to have a national broadcasting service?

MR. NEILL: I do not.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But you need someone.

MR. NEILL: The United States has not got a CBC. Cuba has a very excellent service and has no CBC, neither has Mexico.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But in none of these countries are they obligated to give a national service.

MR. NEILL: No, but they do. In Cuba they give a very fine service; nine hours a day of live programmes on TV over a network covering the whole island, and even the network is owned by the islanders.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is one thing to provide some so-called national service for a 300-

mile long island and a very different thing to provide a national service for a 4000-mile long country scattered across in a thin ribbon such as you have in this country.

MR. NEILL: Yes, but our resources are much greater than those of Cuba.

THE CHAIRMAN: But who is going to mobilize the resources -- just those one hundred and sixty stations scattered across the country?

MR. NEILL: No, not necessarily. We can have networks in Canada similar to the United States whereby the opportunity is given, but nobody is going to organize them if there is no opportunity to use them, and if the opportunity is provided I submit the networks will be established and operated, and there must be a freedom to operate within a certain field. There is no opportunity today to even get network broadcasting established on a regional basis, let alone national.

MR. COYNE: How far can you go in this country, using your own analogy; you said we had more resources than Cuba; the United States has substantially more resources than we have, I think you will agree?

MR. NEILL: Certainly.

MR. COYNE: And they have in television, I think -- you will correct me if I am wrong -- there are two national networks in United States?

MR. NEILL: I think probably that would be so, yes. There may be three; I am not sure.

MR. COYNE: Now, we have a much smaller economy: how many networks, on television, national networks, do you think we can support at the present time?

MR. NEILL: Well, nobody actually knows, but it would be my opinion that eventually we could support alternate networks -- two networks -- but that is a guess.

MR. COYNE: Well, it is just a guess. Wouldn't it be reasonable to assume that if the United States, with its tremendous wealth and the tremendous development of its advertising industry, can only support two ---

MR. NEILL: I am not sure that it is only two.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let us say two and a half.

MR. COYNE: Let us assume it is two: would it be unreasonable to think that we may be only able to support one?

THE CHAIRMAN: Or would it be reasonable to think that we may not be able to support any?

MR. NEILL: Oh, I don't think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Paying all the costs, all the tie-up, of this scattered country -- a national television network. I am not talking about little spur lines running into American networks.

MR. NEILL: You are well aware of the development in other fields that has been accomplished by private ingenuity by Canadians.

THE CHAIRMAN: Such as what?

MR. NEILL: In the development of Labrador mining and the development in Kitimat, British Columbia. The great Bell Telephone System has been done by private interests.

MR. COYNE: But you have no facts or figures or studies. You just have a feeling that private enterprise could do this job?

MR. NEILL: I think those facts and figures could be supplied. I do not have them at the moment, but I will endeavour to have them if you wish to have them for the September hearings. I don't have them at the present time, no.

MR. COYNE: Since we are on this aspect, you say on page ten, speaking of the threat of American domination:

> "It is our opinion that regardless of the system of broadcasting this threat does not exist",

and then you say:

> "Private broadcasters are every bit as loyal citizens as those in public service and are just as anxious to preserve our national identity."

Are you suggesting there is no threat simply because the private broadcasters are loyal citizens and anxious as anyone to preserve our national identity?

MR. NEILL: No, not solely. We have been

quite successful in radio broadcasting, and in television to a lesser degree, in maintaining a very good Canadian service, and we are as anxious as anybody to present Canadian programmes and Canadian scenes. I don't think that because it is the CBC they are any more anxious than we are to preserve our national identity.

MR. COYNE: It is not a question of "anxious" but "able" because they are subsidized.

THE CHAIRMAN: This crops up all the time: people seem to think there is some imputation of disloyalty involved, but nobody has ever suggested that. It is a question of straight cold-blooded economics in a country as scattered as this.

MR. COYNE: Looking back in history I think it may be suggested that every method of communication we have on a national basis in this country has only been developed by the expenditure of public funds -- certainly the Transcontinental Railway System.

MR. NEILL: Well, there has been quite an expenditure of public funds to this date in the broadcasting and television field.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are suggesting that be all swept aside?

MR. NEILL: Not all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, all the stations are to go, all ---

MR. NEILL: No, the programme department

remains.

THE CHAIRMAN: Two-thirds of the hours' programming is to go?

MR. NEILL: I am suggesting it be reduced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. NEILL: But not that it go.

MR. COYNE: But you say, regardless of the system of broadcasting, this threat from the United States does not exist?

MR. NEILL: No, I do not think it does; I think it has been used as a red herring over the years to becloud the issue and I do not think that is the issue at all.

MR. COYNE: Then I think you would agree in this respect, radio and television are different in the nature of their problems than, say,the development of trans-continental railroads, air lines, pipe lines, the development of native Canadian industry behind tariffs?

MR. NEILL: You mean by that in getting capital from outside of the country?

MR. COYNE: No. You say there is no threat regardless of the system of broadcasting, there is no threat of engulfment of Canadian culture by that of the the United States?

MR. NEILL: I do not know of any. Today we have one hundred and fifty-eight or so private stations in Canada; I do not know of any of them that are American owned, in fact, I do not know of any that have any American capital invested in them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me ask you this: your family lived through the early days, what was the fear that led to the appointment of the Aird Commission? Was it not the fear of American engulfment?

MR. NEILL: Not really, no. It was the

pressure of a small group of people who had certain ideas as to how broadcasting should be developed and it was also, if I may say so, the fear of the newspapers to a large extent that radio would be competition for them in the advertising field. That is what led to the present set-up today.

MR. COYNE: Why do you say "a small group" when the original Canadian Broadcasting Act has a rather rare feature in that it was passed unanimously by the House of Commons in 1932?

MR. NEILL: I would say there was a tremendous lobbying effort behind that Act from a small group of people outside and it was supported in many respects by the newspapers of the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that was 1932 and this Act has been on the books since 1937 or 1938 and substantially in its present form; there have been fourteen parliamentary inquiries into it. Do you mean to seriously argue that a small pressure group can keep this up long enough to fool all the people all the time?

MR. NEILL: I suggested that originally that was how it was set up, I am not saying that the same group maintained it -- they don't exist today.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but again on this same point of a small group, at the top of page 10 you say: ". . . a certain vocal minority of our population . . ."?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why do you think it is a minority?

MR. NEILL: Why do I think it is?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Let me explain my question: we have had groups who come before us and say they represent sixty thousand people in Manitoba, forty thousand people, another group in Saskatchewan, seventy-five thousand in British Columbia -- now, all I am asking is, you say you think it is a small minority and these people are opposed directly to the point you are making. How can you say it is still a small minority when that is the evidence we have?

MR. NEILL: It is difficult on the basis of evidence and I appreciate that position, but I would suggest to you that the recommendations that are made by the labour groups and other groups, the Federation of Agriculture, do not represent the number of people that they say they represent. I have checked with many people that are members of these organizations, they have never seen the brief, they know nothing of what was said in those briefs and when they say they represent four million people I do not think they do and I think our findings which were obtained through an independent survey, the Gallup Poll do not bear that out.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have tried to get at this particular point because naturally these big organizations have to weigh their evidence. We

are told in the labour groups this matter has come up over a number of years and discussed frequently at their annual meetings and we said: "How can you speak for so many people?" and they said, "Well, we have discussed it, we have had virtually no protest over the years." Does not that in fact then represent the views of those people? Otherwise, why do these opponents not protest?

MR. FENETY: May I give you an illustration? This had to do with the local Federation of Agriculture, a meeting at which a member of the national office was speaking and I preceded him as a speaker and it was following the Massey Commission Report. I asked the membership and I would believe they were all there, totalling some seven hundred; how many of them had seen the brief that was submitted on their behalf to the Massey Commission, would they please show their hands, and I saw two hands. I asked them how many had approved of it and I received a showing of no hands. The gentleman from Ottawa protested most violently, jumped to his feet and said he was to be the speaker and so on, but the fact remains I was asked to speak after the programme and the gentleman from the national federation left immediately. These people did not know at any time what was being said nor did they approve of it being submitted on their behalf.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apparently that is the individual minority.

MR. NEILL: Certainly that would be a question of vocal minority.

THE CHAIRMAN: The second question I wanted to ask you was this: on the question of threat of American engulfment culturally, in this sphere which you say you are not the least bit worried about, do you think you could make a national programme without government support as has been done over the past twenty years? This is the sort of thing we have had put to us, in television, and we have repeated this several times and we are going to check the facts but it is roughly this: an ordinary programme of the entertainment type costs some $30,000 to produce in the United States and a somewhat similar programme in Canada, perhaps not as elaborate, might cost $10,000 or $12,000. However, you and I as operators of a Canadian network can rent the Canadian rights to that American programme for $2,000. That is only one illustration, and there seem to be many American programmes we ought to be renting for $2,000; there is nothing wrong with them but if those are the relative programming costs and rentals for Canadian programmes, how would we ever have any Canadian programmes?

MR. NEILL: Well, I would suggest that any network that did not provide any Canadian programming would not long continue to be a network. There are certain responsibilities with free enterprise.

THE CHAIRMAN: I agree with that. I do not think we could have a network, we would have a lot of tie-ins with the States.

MR. NEILL: I think the people operating that network would be as responsible as anybody else to see a proper proportion of Canadian programmes were produced. It may be certain entertainment programmes can come in from the United States quite successfully but there are many services that a television station must provide which could not be obtained from American programmes; there are innumerable things of a local and national nature, discussion programmes for one. They would be pointless coming from the United States on Canadian politics; they must be Canadian. The CBC today is drawing on these programmes very, very heavily and I think the network would too, but that will only fill a segment of the broadcasting day, entertainment programming.

MR. FENETY: Is it your opinion if a private network was in operation in Canada there would not be the capital in this country to develop it?

THE CHAIRMAN: I made that clear at the outset; we have no opinions now.

MR. FENETY: Let me express an opinion. There would be capital available and we would be poor free enterprisers if we did not produce programmes for television and I think we could produce them much more economically than they are today and

on a much larger scale. If the freedom is there to operate then the investor knows he has some future and some authority and certainly the investment will be forthcoming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the investment will be forthcoming if it is thought to be a profitable investment?

MR. FENETY: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not going to be forthcoming just by you saying it is.

MR. FENETY: We can only have free enterprise so long as broadcasting was a profit for us. This is a facet we have hardly touched in this country, the development of television programmes, or, for that matter, radio programmes to any great extent but there is Canadian investment in American television shown in Canada, and I say if this is the case now that Canadian capital is forthcoming for the investment in television producing in this country.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question: on page 3 you say:

> "The argument which has been used by those favouring the present discriminatory system of control. . ."

What do you mean by the word "discriminatory"?

MR. NEILL: I mean that the CBC is an operating body operating broadcasting stations and networks and it is controlling at the same time not only its own facilities but that of the private stations. I suggest that the system is

discriminatory in that the CBC is almost duty bound to consider its own situation before it considers that of the private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would think that that would mean there was some discriminating and do you suggest there is some discrimination between the way they treat their interests and yours?

MR. NEILL: Yes, I suggest they look after their own interests -- it is not intentional.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to get at the meaning of the word. Do you suggest that there is discrimination between the regulation of CBC stations and private stations?

MR. NEILL: Yes, sir.

MR. FENETY: Could I give you an example?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. FENETY: In the commercial content regulation you are allowed a certain number of minutes per quarter hour of commercial content. Now, the CBC imports from the United States many soap serials which have a considerably higher proportion of advertising content than is allowed under the regulation. Now, if we are to be forced on one hand to comply with the regulations during our own programme periods why not these soap operas? Why are they not bound by the same regulation?

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be a reason for not carrying soap serials but I do not see that you could call it discrimination.

MR. FENETY: Well, they are allowing something to be carried on their own stations which violates their own regulation.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get at is where you were charging as between the CBC-operated stations and private stations -- they are in fact treating their own stations more leniently or treating private stations more harshly in the enforcement of the regulations -- if that is what you are saying I would like to know, if it is not I would like to know.

MR. NEILL: Here is an example which we as private broadcasters would not like to emulate: Section 5 says that no station can broadcast indecent, profane or obscene language and I would suggest there has been considerable of that on CBC programmes. I would also suggest that if the private broadcasters endeavoured to emulate that they would be severely reprimanded.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am asking a simple question: has there, in your opinion, been more leniency shown to their own stations by the CBC regulating authority and more harshness shown to the private stations by the CBC regulating authority or has there not?

MR. NEILL: It is a very difficult thing to define. I think our association presented a brief on that subject, but I would also suggest that in the licensing of the stations the applications must be approved by the CBC and that they can dictate not

only the allocation of stations but the power and the facilities which they can have, and I suggest that is a discriminatory control.

MR. COYNE: I wonder if we are at cross purposes? You make your point that there were certain things the CBC did which the private stations could not do but I think the Chairman was considering the realm of the regulations as applying to stations A, B, C and so on. Are you suggesting in its broadcast regulation enforcement division,or whatever it is in the CBC, that they discriminate as between one of their own stations and one of the private stations?

MR. FENETY: That would be pretty difficult for us to know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the meaning of your brief?

MR. NEILL: We refer to it as discriminatory in that in our opinion it favours the position of the CBC against private stations.

MR. COYNE: Then you are answering my question "no". We have already disposed of the discriminatory feature in the control, we understand that, as between, for instance, the advertising content or these various other things, -- are you charging though that actual discrimination in administration of regulations as between someone who happened to be one of their employees operating a station and somebody who happened to be a private broadcaster?

MR. NEILL: Not particularly. We have not detailed it to that extent; we say the control from the licensing down is discriminatory. We do not specify regulatory control.

MR. COYNE: Would you answer "no" to my question?

MR. NEILL: That it is not discriminatory?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that they are not discriminating?

MR. NEILL: No. I would not answer "yes" or "no" to that question because I don't have access to what is happening.

MR. COYNE: You have no specific illustrations to charge the CBC with in this field?

MR. NEILL: Of discrimination?

MR. COYNE: Yes?

MR. NEILL: No, I would not ---

MR. COYNE: I am not talking about the licensing or the fact that you cannot operate networks or anything of that kind. You have made that point. This is merely a matter of discriminating between one operator and another and in the enforcement of one regulation or another. That is a very simple question and you are not reducing the effectiveness of your earlier point by answering it one way or the other.

MR. FENETY: We say we have no way of knowing.

MR. COYNE: Then you have no evidence to support a charge of discrimination?

MR. NEILL: I would suggest there is a regulation of the CBC which says that no station shall broadcast transcriptions between 7.30 and 11.15 at night. Now there is a quota set up under the CBC regulations for certain stations and I would say that had been used by the CBC to force private stations to carry more network programmes. I have the figures here: CFRB in Toronto was given more time for the use of transcribed programmes than CFNB in Fredericton. If it was purely from excess of programme material it would certainly be CFRB would have more access to live programming than CFNB. There could be no other idea but that it was used in forcing CFNB to carry more network service. That quota is not in existence today; it existed for some time but I think the regulation still exists -- the regulations were revised in 1953 and since that time there has been no effort to enforce that regulation that I know of.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if there has been no effort, no effort has been equally applied to both private and CBC stations?

MR. NEILL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then there is no discrimination in that?

MR. NEILL: Not today, no.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On page 9 of your brief, paragraph 2, you say:

> "We do not object to being licensed, but do feel that the present method

of assessment goes far beyond what we term reasonable and just."

Would you expand on that somewhat?

MR. NEILL: Yes. We are licensed to do -- rather, licence fees are based on our financial statement of gross revenue -- a percentage of our gross revenue taxed by the Transport Department. We do not feel that a licence should be based on gross revenue, we do not feel that is fair.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Why?

MR. NEILL: Well, a licence is a fee that is charged for a certain right or a certain service and it should be a fixed charge. Any licence that is based on revenue is more a tax than a licence.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But would you not agree that a station operating in Toronto or Montreal with a much larger potential listening audience than you have here should pay more for it? Does he not have a greater privilege than you?

MR. NEILL: No, I do not think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: If that is the case then would there not be a possibility that the licence fee would be set on the basis of that very remunerative station to the detriment of the smaller stations throughout the country?

MR. NEILL: For many years we operated under a fixed licence fee of, I think, $50 or $100 a year, and every station, as far as I am aware, was completely satisfied with that arrangement. It is only in recent years that this new arrangement has been

put into effect. Now, if that money was being used to promote, to improve the technical operation of broadcasting stations -- for instance, we have a condition in Canada today which is a very serious one; television receivers have been put on the market and they generate an interference that is generated throughout this country. I do not think that should have happened. I think the money the broadcasters are turning into the - - the licence money should have been used to overcome that because that condition has deteriorated the value of radio very greatly throughout this country and it is something that could have been corrected.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It seems to me, on the basis of your suggestion you would be discriminating right off the bat in charging the station in Fredericton the same fee as the station in Montreal. There would be discrimination against you right there, I would think.

MR. NEILL: I think that is subject to many points of view. If the fee is for the licence I do not think what the station is able to make of that licence is important. If the fee is for providing the licence and the money is used for maintaining frequency allocations and order in the air lane -- I am speaking of technical air -- and for the control of interference, I cannot see that the revenue of the station has any bearing. There are stations in Montreal, some that make far more money than others simply through their ingenuity and

effort and so on. Why should they be penalized because they have done more to serve the public and provide a better service than the people who sat back and have not done as well?

THE CHAIRMAN: Is not the thing that is licensed in Toronto different from the thing that is licensed in Fredericton? Is not the right different?

MR. NEILL: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They have given a much more valuable right to a man who owns a station in Toronto than a man who owns a station in Cranbrooke, B.C.?

MR. NEILL: It would depend on the power.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the market, the opportunity to make money?

MR. NEILL: I do not think the opportunity to make money should be tied in with the licence. We have our corporation tax which applies to all business equally and they control that situation because if the station gets more revenue it pays a higher tax.

THE CHAIRMAN: But most corporations or businesses you can get if you have the necessary skill and capital and ingenuity and you cannot do it in radio and television because of the limited number of channels?

MR. NEILL: Theoretically, but they are limited more by economics than by any other factor.

MR. COYNE: Suppose you opened these channels for competition by auction, you would certainly find private operators who were prepared to

pay a lot more to broadcast in Toronto than a small town in the interior of British Columbia?

MR. NEILL: I would think so.

MR. FENETY: Would you assume then ---

MR. COYNE: I never answer any questions.

MR. FENETY: Excuse me. Let me say when the $2.50 radio licence fee existed that a person in Toronto, because he had greater access to more stations, should pay a higher licence fee than a person in Fredericton?

THE CHAIRMAN: I would answer that. If you can work it out, probably yes in an ideal system but you cannot very well charge a separate rate for that licence fee. In fact, they were not able to charge a single fee and collect it with any efficiency.

MR. FENETY: Well, those people do have an advantage. The listener in Toronto does have an advantage but I would not feel he should be penalized by paying more for it. I am willing to face it, there are advantages to living in a large city and disadvantages to living in a smaller centre. Of course, there are advantages both ways. However, the mere fact that we have a licence is one thing and the fact we are taxed on our gross revenue is another; I feel a licence is a licence whether it is in Toronto or Cranbrooke, B.C., and the licence is only what the individual operator makes of it. If he makes a success of it ---

MR. COYNE: Surely that is a very common procedure? The Crown charges stumpage fees for the

right to go and cut wood on Crown land and in the oil producing provinces the Crown taxes on gross revenue?

MR. NEILL: But that is a different situation.

MR. FENETY: Based on his cut entirely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Should it not be based on your cut?

MR. NEILL: They are selling the timber to market.

MR. COYNE: They are selling a right here.

MR. NEILL: I would disagree with that. I do not think they are selling a right and it is made perfectly clear that it is not a sale.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: A licensing right.

MR. NEILL: It is a sale to take that timber out and dispose of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: At the bottom of page 8 you say:

> "In the matter of licensing, we do not feel that the present system is in the best interests of the stations or their advertisers."

Is there not a curious omission? Is not the real thing we have to decide, whether it is in the best interests of the public?

MR. NEILL: I do not think it is in the best interests of the public either. I think the money that is collected -- the money from licence

fees last year amounted to $293,000 from private stations and that has gone to the CBC. I think it would be much better spent on the elimination of television interference to radio broadcasting. I think it would be much more useful in that field.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it necessarily have been more use to the public?

MR. NEILL: Yes, it certainly would because we are getting a very serious situation at the present time from television interference, whole areas have been eliminated from radio by television interference.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the amount that was collected last year from licence fees?

MR. NEILL: That is the figure I have, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Neill and Mr. Fenety. We have obviously been interested in your brief by the number of questions we have had.

MR. NEILL: Thank you very much for a very generous hearing.

SUBMISSION OF
HUMANITIES ASSOCIATION OF CANADA
FREDERICTON BRANCH

Appearances:

Prof. A. Lucas

Prof. D. L. C. Miller

Prof. W. A. G. McAndrew

Prof. D. R. Galloway

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we will receive is that of the Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch. I am not sure who is to present the brief, but the first name on my list is that of Mr. Clark.

MR. LUCAS: Mr. Clark is not present, but I am the chairman of the committee, and my name is Mr. Lucas.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin, Mr. Lucas, by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 149.

EXHIBIT NO. 149: Brief of Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you go ahead and present the brief, please?

MR. LUCAS: Before I present the brief I would like to introduce to you and your colleagues Mr. Turcotte and Mr. Stewart those with me: this is Mr. Miller, Mr. McAndrew and Mr. Galloway.

Humanities Association of Canada, Fredericton Branch.

The Fredericton Branch of the Humanities Association of Canada is naturally concerned with the place of radio and television in our national life, and wishes to present to the Royal Commission its observations regarding the role of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the private broadcasters. In this brief we shall discuss the following matters: (1) the place of the CBC in promoting Canadian unity and culture; (2) the possibilities of television as a medium of adult education; (3) present broadcasting coverage in central New Brunswick, and, (4) a consideration of some of the most frequent arguments against the CBC and its regulatory function.

The Place of the CBC in Canadian Unity and Culture: It goes without saying that in a democratic society radio and television broadcasting have an obligation to both entertain and enlighten. It seems equally evident to us, however, that in Canada our broadcasting media have added responsibilities to fulfill. Situated as we are, a thinly-scattered population in a vast country, and exposed to the economic and cultural influences of our southern neighbour, our broadcasting system has a great task to perform in the promotion of national unity and the encouragement of Canadian talent. Just as the adoption of the "National Policy" and the building of an all-Canadian transportation system were necessary to the economic survival of Canada, so does the maintenance and extension of a national broadcasting network seem a vital necessity

to the survival of a Canadian identity. What these projects were and are to the Canadian economy, so the CBC is to Canadian culture. To entertain and enlighten; to promote among Canadians an awareness of their common heritage, both French and English; and to encourage Canadian talent, which otherwise might be overwhelmed by American predominance; these seem to us to be the purposes of the CBC, and the justification for its existence and development.

We are living in a period when society is growing ever more complex at an accelerated rate. The functions of government are expanding at all levels, the average size of the productive unit grows larger and more complicated and makes increasing demands on the individual, new organizations serving particular ends, yet endeavouring to obtain general support and assistance, are emerging. On the basis of democratic theory, the general direction of this society, over time, is to be regulated and guided by an informed electorate exerting their will through political action.

The average citizen, however, grows less and less competent to deal with the great mass of issues on which he is required to pass judgment. "Should the Federal budget be balanced?" -- "Is it wise to raise the bank rate to three per cent?" -- "Do recent changes in the Soviet Union require a change in foreign policy?" -- "Is it wise to curtail the army and the navy and to rely on airpower?" All these questions raise issues which are of the greatest

importance to the livelihood and well-being of every Canadian citizen. But how many Canadians can even grasp the essentials of the issues involved in these questions?

It is obvious that, in a free society, the increasing complexity of life should be accompanied by increasing efforts to educate the adult population so that they may think intelligently about the issues which ultimately they must decide as citizens. Unfortunately, the increasing complexity of society has been accompanied by technological developments which make a broad programme of adult education possible as never before. One of these technological developments has been television, which could be a very important instrument for mass education, since the television screen makes available for this purpose most effective techniques.

It is desirable then that television should be used, to a considerable degree, as a medium of mass adult education. The CBC has already shown, to some extent, that it is cognizant of this fact. We suggest that it take further steps to develop television for this purpose, and that the universities are well equipped to assist in television programmes that would be a part of such a development.

The gap between the increasing complexity of our society and the understanding of the average citizen has grown dangerously large. A programme of adult education by the universities using the medium of television should do much to narrow this

gap. It would indeed be tragic if some Gibbon of the future, reflecting on the decline of North American civilization, could say of our use of television: "They used it only to watch wrestling matches and to sell soap."

The majority of people in central New Brunswick are dependent on Radio Station CFNB for their programmes. During the past few years requests have been made to the CBC for another station. About a year ago, a group of Fredericton citizens wrote to Mr. Dunton, the Chairman of the CBC Board of Governors, asking that a booster station be established. Mr. Dunton replied that if such a station were set up CFNB would not be required to carry any CBC programmes, and that many people in the country districts would not be able to hear the CBC at all because a booster station would not be powerful enough to reach them.

During the next few years, a new town will spring up near the Army training area at Camp Gagetown which will include people from all over Canada, and, within the next ten years, the population of the Fredericton-Oromocto area will probably double. It is estimated also that the population of the University of New Brunswick will double, and we feel that we should not be forced to rely any longer on the fare which has, so far, been offered by the local radio station. We are not suggesting that the local station has not fulfilled its obligations as it understands them, but many people understand these

differently and we feel that it cannot supply many of the needs of an expanding area. We deplore the low quality of many of the programmes. It may be that CFNB, as it claims, is, on the whole supplying the majority of its listeners with what they want, but we must suspect surveys conducted among listeners most of whom can listen to only one station. And do the surveys take into account that many people seldom listen at all because the programmes are so bad?

We feel that one of the aims of any radio station should be to encourage local talent. Radio Station CFNB has shown comparatively little interest in local talent, and such encouragement as they have given has usually been to mediocre entertainment.

Even a booster station in central New Brunswick would not be enough. We need a CBC station properly equipped to originate programmes of all kinds. Such a station would help to give developments in this area more recognition than they have, so far, received and it would help to encourage local talent of all kinds.

The people of a growing democracy must be kept informed of developments in the world at large. The increasing sales, all over the Western World, of paper-backed books on politics, economics, science, art, philosophy, and so forth, seem to indicate that there is a growing demand for information on these and other subjects. The Federal Government has recognized the necessity for more higher education, if we are to keep pace with developments in Soviet

Russia. The survival of Canada (and the Western World) may depend on the ability of its people to keep that pace. We feel that the CBC, primarily a non-profit organization, is better able to do the job than a local station, the policy of which often depends on profit rather than on mature services to the public.

One form of attack against the CBC is the attempt to identify the limitations imposed on broadcasting by the regulations of the Corporation with controls on publishing. In other words, a serious attempt is made to relate radio and television to the press, thus raising the issue of liberty of expression or the right to publish, a freedom without which democracy cannot exist, and to demonstrate that the regulations of the CBC deny this central fact.

The right to publish a newspaper is conditioned by the economy, the number of newspapers being determined by the demand. This situation does not hold with radio and television. These media are monopolistic by their nature for technical reasons. The successful applicant for a licence to broadcast must agree to accept certain responsibilities. His freedom is conditioned by the fact that he enjoys a privilege. The restrictions imposed on his freedom are peculiar to radio and television. We expect these restrictions to be precise and to relate to the matter in hand. The holder of a licence to broadcast should not enjoy a vested right.

May we say that, because radio and television are means of communication, they are forms of

publication similar to the press? The aim of the press is primarily to inform. The aim of radio and television is to entertain as well as inform; a newspaper is not the performance of a symphony by Beethoven, nor is it the Ed Sullivan show. Furthermore we enjoy complete freedom to obtain as many newspapers as we wish, for geography imposes no serious restrictions on our choice. These circumstances do not hold for radio and television, and in many areas of Canada the listener is limited to a very few stations at most.

Again may we ask, since it is argued that complete freedom to advertise is vital to the freedom of the press, whether a similar freedom to advertise over the air becomes the basis without which radio and television are no longer democratic? In the first place the advertising in a newspaper is there to be read or disregarded. Its presence adds nothing, removes nothing from the news. Secondly, radio advertising is intrusive and persuasive owing to the human voice. Its claims require constant supervision so that it does not constitute an invasion of human privacy or disregard man's dignity by stressing the physical or material.

On all these counts we consider the analogy of broadcasting with publishing to be false and misleading.

(b) The Demand for an Independent Regulatory Body: Considerable publicity has been given to the proposal of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters that there should be an "independent regulatory

body" to regulate broadcasting in Canada. The contention is that under the existing system the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation regulates not only its own activities but those of its alleged competitors (the private broadcasters) as well. The CBC is, to quote from a CAB pamphlet, "prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner, with no right of appeal." "This staggering combination of power is not democratic," the pamphlet continues, "and therefore not in the public interest." It is further alleged that democratic government necessitates a division of the executive, legislative and judicial functions, the implication being that the CBC is exercising all three. A third party supervising both the CBC and the private broadcasters would, it is claimed, remedy this violation of principle. This independent regulatory body, it is argued, would occupy a position vis-a-vis the CBC and the private broadcasters similar to that occupied by the Board of Transport Commissioners with respect to the CNR, CPR and other railways in Canada. Such, in brief, are some of the arguments put forth in favour of relieving the CBC of its regulatory powers.

Whatever may be the motives which inspire this demand of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters for a separate regulatory body, the Fredericton Branch of the Humanities Association, after earnest consideration, has come to the conclusion that the arguments used in support of this demand are specious. For the sake of brevity we will advert

to only a few of the reasons for this conclusion.

The regulatory function of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is vested in a Board of Governors, eleven in number, and representing the various regions of Canada, each of whom has taken an oath pledging impartial execution of his duties and disavowing any pecuniary interest in radio or television. This Board is charged with the task of regulating all broadcasting in the public interest. There is no evidence whatever that it has not done so in an independent and impartial manner, nor have any of the numerous Parliamentary Committees which have examined the activities of the Board found instances of injustice or discrimination. We are struck by the fact that even the CAB, whatever it may say in its pamphlets, has not ventured in its appearance before Parliamentary Committees to make specific complaints about the Board of Governors or its regulations. I should refer you to the footnote: There is a great contrast between the loose charges made in the CAB pamphlet, "The Case for Freedom of Information," (published early in 1953?), and the repeated admissions of Mr. T. J. Allard, General Manager of the CAB, before a Parliamentary Committee in April, 1953, that he had no specific complaints to make. The fact that the Board of Governors is responsible to Parliament is ample assurance that it is not both prosecutor and judge of its own case.

The Board of Governors is also charged with the task of formulating policy for a national system of radio and television broadcasting. The responsibility for the day to day operation of this system is vested in a General Manager who is appointed by the Governor General in Council. This separation of the policy-making and operating functions seems to us to be an adequate safeguard against the "staggering combination of power" of which the CAB complains. The separation of the legislative and executive functions is not as it happens a feature of British governmental practice (as the CAB mistakenly assumes, and in support of which misconception it points oddly enough to the example of the American Constitution), but in any case the fact that the policy-making function is exercised by an independent and impartial Board which is responsible to Parliament is, in our view, sufficient assurance that both the democratic process and the public interest are being maintained.

Finally, it should be noted that the Board of Governors in regulating both the CBC and the private broadcasters is not in the position of adjudicating between competitors. The analogy with the Board of Transport Commissioners, like the analogy with the press, both of which the CAB is so fond of drawing, turns out upon examination to be false. The CBC is charged by Parliament with the task of developing a national broadcasting network, while the private stations are left with local needs to serve. So far from competing with the private broadcasters, the

CBC supplies its alleged competitors with millions of dollars worth of programmes every year, free of charge, and pays delivery costs as well. Privately-owned stations which are affiliated with the CBC are paid for carrying the network commercial programmes, thus sharing indirectly but heavily in the public and commercial income of the CBC. Moreover, the CBC does not accept local advertising in areas where a private station is available for the purpose. Thus the national network and the private stations are not competitive but complementary.

In sum, then, we consider that the existing system whereby an impartial Board of Governors regulates both the national network and the local stations best serves the public interest. To set over this Board yet another supervisory body would be an unnecessary duplication of agencies, and would have the effect of crippling the CBC in its performance of the tasks assigned to it by Parliament, while at the same time rendering more difficult the salutary surveillance over that performance which Parliament, through its Committees, is at present able to exercise. The CAB insistently demands an independent regulatory body. In actual practice the Board of Governors of the CBC is such a body, responsible to Parliament and safeguarding the public interest.

In conclusion the Fredericton Branch of the Humanities Association would like to affirm its support for the existing system of broadcasting

in Canada. We have stressed the vital importance of the CBC in the promotion of national unity and encouragement of Canadian talent. The potentialities of television as a means of adult education have led us to the suggestion that more time be set aside for this purpose, and that the institutions of higher learning be called upon to assist. We have also drawn attention to the existing situation in radio and television in central New Brunswick. Specifically, we would like to have much greater CBC coverage than is available at present, and feel that this need, together with growing population, justifies a second station in this area with facilities which would also encourage regional talent. Finally, we have dealt with arguments frequently used against the present system of public enterprise in national radio and television broadcasting, namely, the false analogy with the press which is put forward on the behalf of the private broadcasters, and the demand for a separate regulatory body.

We realize that some of our proposals involve increased expenditures on the part of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. At present a large part of the CBC's revenues comes from an excise tax on radio and television equipment, an uncertain and very probably declining source of income once the market demand for television equipment levels off. We would like to see this replaced by a Parliamentary grant, based on such an

amount per head of population in Canada as to give the CBC a substantially greater income than it now has. Such a stable income, growing with population, would enable the CBC to undertake the degree of long-range planning which its vital role in Canadian life requires.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lucas. We will go right on to the questions, and I would like you to feel free to call on any of your associates to answer the questions or to amplify any of your answers.

MR. COYNE: What is the Humanities Association of Canada?

MR. LUCAS: Well, I suppose one could define it as a group of people who are interested in music, literature and so on; I am avoiding the word "culture". Many of these people you will find on the university campuses across the country, and you find them locally -- ministers, high school teachers, and so on, and this is a national association across the ten provinces.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can the odd business man get in too?

MR. LUCAS: Oh, yes, anybody who wishes to pay. I am not suggesting I collect fees here, but anyone who has a dollar and a quarter can join.

MR. COYNE: Is it a national association divided into chapters or branches across the country?

MR. LUCAS: Yes. I am not sure how many members there are in the Humanities Association. There must be three or four thousand, at least.

MR. COYNE: Do you know how many branches there are?

MR. LUCAS: There must be twenty, at least.

MR. COYNE: What is the membership of the Fredericton Branch in numbers?

MR. LUCAS: Well, the membership is at the present time thirty, but if I may carry on here for a moment, our meetings, usually four in number, have fifty, and sometimes more. At our last meeting here, given over last week to a discussion of Sir Charles G. D. Roberts, must have had one hundred people present. So, I make no pretense of appearing for a great number of people, but we are spreading across the country and would like to have our say in a situation where we feel silence would give consent.

MR. COYNE: Dealing with your first point about the place of CBC in Canadian unity and culture, in the paragraph on page 1 you analogize between the radio sphere and such things as the national policy and the building of an all-Canadian transportation system: and you say,

> " . . . so does the maintenance and extension of a national broadcasting network seem a vital necessity to the survival of a Canadian identity."

Why do you think that a national network --- by which I take it you mean a publicly-owned network?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: . . . is necessary for this purpose? Why do you think there could not be a

private network which would also perform the same service directed towards the survival of a Canadian identity?

MR. LUCAS: Well, I think there are several reasons. First of all, I think that the -- at least, I believe that the national system, publicly-owned stations, came into existence because the private people were not doing anything for a great number of areas which wanted radio programmes. In the second place, who is going to form this body which will govern what these private stations -- 160 of them or something, or maybe 15 or 20 -- they are going to have some form of body, and we use the words "national" and "public" rather loosely here, but I had in mind a group of people joining together who may not be concerned with some things which we consider in the national interest. Money perhaps would be the chief object, and the basis for the combination would be monetary, and if they didn't see a chance of making some money, these kind of things would not get on the air and then our culture, which I have referred to here, might not get the chance to develop. Perhaps even there could be a national system, but I am afraid even then it would only be national in a sense -- several people would be working together and they would not be concerned with some of the things we would like them to be concerned with.

MR. COYNE: Is your point really that this is an end or an aim which should not be dependent upon its commercial success?

MR. LUCAS: Definitely. We are anti-commercial and we feel commercialism has crept into everything -- it is creeping into it -- and it struck us that the CBC is one of those forces which works two ways: it nationalizes and it does give us a centre so that all the stations can work together, and it would be necessary to have somebody at the centre, whether private or public; somebody has to take control, and then you are going to have to put pressure on somebody because I don't think there is ever going to be a society in which everybody will agree on everything. We prefer to see that control in the hands of a group responsible to Parliament and not responsible to a group of people who want to make some money. Furthermore, to go back over the question, we feel "national" has another meaning, in that we have a music, and an art and a literature, and it should be encouraged.

MR. COYNE: You summarize at one stage your position when you say you support the present system of broadcasting?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And you said just now that you are anti-commercial: under the present system the CBC depends to some extent, and in television to some considerable extent, upon commercial revenues. When you say you are anti-commercial, do you mean you are against advertising on ---

MR. LUCAS: I might answer your question by saying that we are anti-commercial but we hope we are not sky-flying idealists.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask a question on the same point as to what you really meant by the phrase "anti-commercial": it could be either that you were opposed to commercialism in radio at all, or that you were opposed to the development of radio and television being based in the main upon commercial considerations, and I wanted to know which it was.

MR. LUCAS: It is the second, Mr. Fowler. By "anti-commercial" I feel, speaking for the group, we are not so naive as to think this world can run without people making money, but we would hate to see our system which we like so much shelved or undermined by a system which would be basically commercial. CBC makes money out of selling programmes or advertising and what not, but we think basically it is non-profit, and so it does consider certain aspects we were afraid may never be considered, or considered very seldom.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you consider that having regard to the various factors you have mentioned --- the question of education and enlightenment of various kinds --- that there also is a legitimate function for radio and television to perform in the field of the distribution of goods? Could you accept this as being a valid one of the several objectives to be attained by a broadcasting system?

MR. LUCAS: The word "goods" . . . ?

THE CHAIRMAN: Goods and services -- I don't mean goods in the sense of absolute goods. I mean the distribution of goods and services.

MR. LUCAS: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The argument we have had put to us, and it has come in several places, is that part of our standard of living does depend upon our ability to make and to merchandise more quantities of goods and services.

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that one of the things which assists in this distribution, and therefore in a higher standard of physical living, at least, is the power of advertising and allowing people to know of the availability of goods and services for purchase?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you admit this is within your concept in this first part of the Canadian unity and culture? Do you admit this as a legitimate function of radio and television?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you would really be coming very close to the proposal put forward to us by the University Group of British Columbia, that culture was the sum total of Canadian life, and therefore you don't have to be afraid of the word.

MR. COYNE: On your second point, page 3, you are speaking of television as a medium of mass adult education:

> "The CBC has already shown, to some extent, that it is cognizant of this fact. We suggest that it take further steps to develop

television for this purpose, and that the universities are well equipped to assist in television programmes that would be a part of such a development."

Have you any specific ideas in mind as to how, in practice, television can be developed as a medium of adult education?

MR. LUCAS: Well, we had some. I don't think they are particularly original. The height of our imagination seemed to be that a university professor could get on the air some time and talk about various subjects. It is being done in other countries. That seems to be about the limit of the precision of our imagination, but we did think that perhaps in regions -- and the country is now divided into regions -- there may be some way whereby universities in the area -- and there are several in the Maritimes -- could play a little more active role. Television gives certain freedom for display of teaching techniques, and we thought perhaps there may be some way in which a few of the universities in the Maritimes might be banded together to cooperate, one, for instance, handling a subject like the economics of the Maritimes and another one in Nova Scotia handling something else; so we would be using television as a unifying force. At the present time there is a lot of talk about these four provinces getting together to discuss problems,

and we thought, for these regions, perhaps we could draw it to the attention of this Commission that it may be advantageous for the CBC or for the people responsible for broadcasting to put a little more emphasis on the devices of higher education as a possibility for television programmes.

MR. COYNE: You are really thinking more along a general line, and this is a medium which should be developed to a greater extent, or a larger amount of time spent on this phase of it?

MR. LUCAS: Yes, I think we are quite well aware that university professors and the people we are thinking of are probably not particularly fine TV stars.

MR. COYNE: Photogenic?

MR. LUCAS: We thought perhaps we had something there in that the Maritimes is not particularly unified, and by cooperating with other schools in this area television being a vital way of giving out information and enlightenment, we may discuss some problems in the various fields that the Maritime people would be interested in.

MR. COYNE: Is there room for any initiative on the part of universities themselves in this field?

MR. LUCAS: My first tendency is to say I don't know, but I think that there may be, whereby if there was any chance, a certain person in the University of New Brunswick who has been associated

with radio in the past may be appointed to make arrangements. Is that what you mean?

MR. COYNE: Yes, I was really thinking -- I suppose there are two sides to the question, and CBC has to make some facilities available, but on the other hand there has to be some movement of an educational nature, if you like, to generate any programming, really?

MR. LUCAS: Yes. Well, I don't know whether this is appropriate to comment, but I do know that on the campus here, and even in the little chit-chat after Humanities Association meetings there are people who seem to talk as if they would like to encourage some kind of television programmes from the campus. Perhaps they haven't thought of the difficulties, and we are fully aware of the fact that there are great difficulties, but I think the universities by and large would be willing to act on their own behalf if they thought there would be any chance of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what lies behind Mr. Coyne's question is, you have it here, you say the universities are well equipped to assist and that is a fairly general phrase.

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it would be much easier for the CBC, or, for that matter, a private station to appraise the idea that you had if, so to speak, the universities would work up some suggestions or even a university would come forward with an idea that here is a series and they have the following men and have certain objectives and would like to see it put across, and they may or may not be accepted, but it would make it concrete rather than very general.

MR. LUCAS: In other words, the word "assist"?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. It seems to me the initiation does not have to come from the CBC or the private television station, perhaps the initiation could come from the universities themselves. I think that was the point of the question.

MR. COYNE: Yes. Turning to the next aspect of your brief dealing with the situation in central New Brunswick you say on page 4:

> "Radio Station CFNB has shown comparatively little interest in local talent, and such encouragement as they have given has usually been to mediocre entertainment."

Do you suggest they have actually sought out the mediocre rather than the best?

MR. LUCAS: It reads as if that were the intention, perhaps, but it was not.

MR. COYNE: What is your attitude towards local talent; is there any virtue in putting on local talent just because it is local and even if it is not talent? I mean this seriously.

MR. LUCAS: I take your question seriously. Yes, I think it has some virtue because I can answer your question this way, as you assume in a sense that local talent is or would be mediocre. I think what I am getting at here is that local talent does not necessarily mean mediocre nor do I feel or do we feel that there has been enough searching for local talent. If I may go on for a moment, I quite agree with you that I do not want to listen to someone who is excrutiatingly bad on the radio just because he lives next door to me, but I do feel a local station has quite a large area to work over, and our feeling is that this field has not been worked over.

MR. COYNE: That is, there is a balance to be struck and you do not think there has been quite enough local talent?

MR. LUCAS: No, I think not. I can say there has been considerable local talent in terms of speakers and so on and hilly-billy bands. We have had a great many of them, but I think there are other kinds of local talent which I would not mind listening to. The Town orchestra, it is

certainly not ---

MR. COYNE: What about the specific problem that arises; for instance, you have a young local violinist. The radio station is serving a mass audience, the radio station can put on the local violinist or put on Fritz Kreisler. How do you balance your choice when you are faced with that choice? They have Fritz Kreisler on a record?

MR. LUCAS: If the fellow is any good give him a chance, and if he is not any good I would not listen to him any more and I will probably listen to Fritz Kreisler in my own home. If we hope to develop local talent in Canada we cannot assume that a young fellow comes along and if he is not as good as Fritz Kriesler we should not listen to him.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to put your position this way, there is some duty on broadcasting stations to devote some time and effort to the broadcasting of local talent?

MR. LUCAS: That is right. If it proves it is not very good it can be dropped, but we cannot tell whether it is good, bad or indifferent if we do not hear it.

MR. COYNE: You feel in your local station you have not had sufficient?

MR. LUCAS: That is the feeling of our Society, the panel discussions, concerts, plays and what not, as far as we know ---

THE CHAIRMAN: On a somewhat similar point

but applying it differently, what about the national programme -- here you are talking about the private stations and the local programmes; how do you suggest programming should be judged on the national programme as between the advantage of choosing the best violinist or best orchestra you can find wherever that person happens to be and the advantage of accepting some degredation of quality, if you like, in the programme in the interest of fostering local organizations, musical and cultural and so forth? In other words, which of the two methods is the one you would support?

MR. LUCAS: Well, I do not wish to seem to be sitting on the fence but I support both of them in the sense that I like CBC programmes but if there is someone locally who seems to be quite competent and he has a chance to play a violin on the radio -- I do not say I want to listen to him all the time, I think the problem is that we are human beings and sometimes we want to listen to Fritz Kreisler and the next night we probably do not. If I can make my point clear, our Society likes the CBC programmes but we would also feel there is a wider chance or a greater chance for the cultivation of local talent perhaps a little more.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am really asking you a different question, and that is as to the role of the CBC in your idea in the development of what you might call decentralization of programme production. We have had a conflict of evidence about it. I think we had one witness who argued that the objective in the national programme should be top-flight quality

and you should go as far as necessary in order to get top-flight quality. In other words, if the best orchestra to be had to play a certain symphony was in Toronto you would go to Toronto to get it and prefer to have that on the national programme than to have the same symphony played perhaps, let us say, competently, by a local orchestra. The other side of the evidence has been that by putting that local orchestra on the air you gradually over the years build up orchestras that you otherwise would not have had. You may not have given it consideration, but those are the broad questions that we have had put to us.

MR. LUCAS: Well, I have not really given it consideration but since our group is pro-CBC I would say that we would like the CBC to give us the best it can, and if we are concerned in the regional -- for instance, sometimes in a regional broadcast we might have a chance to show the regional people to national Trans-Canada, and it goes through the national network. I suppose you feel I am compromising.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, no. There are different kinds of compromises. What you are saying is for the really big programmes you ought to make them as good as you can, but there is still room in the overall programming for the regional and less expert production -- is that not what you are saying?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Turning to page 5 where you are speaking about the analogy with the press, and you are drawing a distinction between the newspaper and radio,

you say:

> "The right to publish a newspaper is conditioned by the economy, the number of newspapers being determined by the demand. This situation does not hold with radio and television. These media are monopolistic by their nature for technical reasons."

Now, it has been put to us that although it is theoretically true that the number of radio stations is limited for technical reasons, in point of actual fact the only limitation at the moment on the number of radio stations is the same sort of economic reason that limits the number of newspapers. Now, if that were so do you think that may affect the argument or thesis which you build up based on the monopolistic, this technical monopoly or limitation of air channels?

MR. LUCAS: I might turn this over to Mr. McAndrew.

MR. McANDREW: It seems to me from what I have heard this morning and what I have read in the newspapers, it is not accepted as a fact that these limitations are only theoretical. The opinion has been voiced that possibly within a twenty-five year period the nature of the medium would revert to this condition where there are only so many channels. I would suggest a twenty-five year period is really too short a period of time for a man to change his view on this subject.

MR. COYNE: You mean you are afraid that in the future you will not have enough channels?

MR. McANDREW: Yes, I think that is a fact, it has not been proved conclusively to be wrong.

MR. COYNE: Even though at the present time there are more channels available in Canada than we are ready to occupy?

MR. McANDREW: Has that been demonstrated to be true?

MR. COYNE: I do not think any conclusions have been reached by the Commission but I was putting it to you as a hypothetical question based on the evidence given to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it has been clear up to now that this is a situation which varies from one place to another. You get it particularly clearly in the television field where at the present time the practical, useful channels are in some cases few in number but you even there get variations depending upon geography and other things.

MR. McANDREW: Mr. Chairman, my feeling is if I had unlimited funds and possibly a certain lack of foresight I could enter into the newspaper field in the City of Toronto. I venture to suggest it may be more difficult to obtain a licence to set up a new station in Toronto. Suppose I try to say that I would like to have the licence and the wave length of CFRB in Toronto? I can compete with the Globe and Mail but would it be my right to go in and say, "I am going to take CFRB, use their wave length"? There is a

difference.

MR. COYNE: And you feel that this difference is a valid and real one?

MR. McANDREW: I think it is sufficiently noteworthy for one to be disturbed by this effort to relate television and radio to newspaper publishing. That is my feeling.

MR. MILLER: May I say something on this? It seems this concerns us particularly in this area because it is covered primarily by one station and the analogy of the press and radio does not always work to the advantage of radio in this case, and it can be taken from another angle altogether. We believe that the safeguards of the CBC regulations, far from retarding freedom of expression, will probably allow a good deal more freedom of expression. Now, we have certain evidence to suggest that the analogy does not always work to the advantage of radio in this local area. This is somewhat off the point but nevertheless there is a relevance here since the CBC was directly and rather harshly attacked and termed as one of the enemies of England. The particular attack also seemed to support the local station and the manager owner was mentioned by name in the particular attack. I think there is enough there to make us feel that we want the safeguards that the CBC now gives and makes us also very chary of the analogy of radio and press, particularly as it refers to this area. I could give you this evidence

if you like; I can support it, but it would take time.

THE CHAIRMAN: We might call on you for that later.

MR. COYNE: I think the point is perfectly clear. I just wanted to find out your reaction to this other view that has been put to us. Now, at another point on page 8 near the bottom of the page, you are saying that the CBC and the private broadcasters are not really competitors, and towards the bottom of the paragraph you say:

> "Moreover, the CBC does not accept local advertising in areas where a private station is available for the purpose."

Now, I understand from earlier evidence which we have received that by and large that is accurate, they do not solicit local advertising as such in the television field. On the other hand, where there is this single channel policy in these areas where the CBC operates stations it solicits and carries local advertising. Now, if the single channel policy were to be abandoned and second private stations were to be established in Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, do you think that the CBC should continue to solicit local advertising as it does today, and would it not in those circumstances be in direct competition with the local second television station?

MR. LUCAS: If it accepts advertising in the area, yes, it would be in direct competition. One gets into the problem of finances here, but I

would say that it should not, it should try if possible to carry on the same as the successful radio or sound broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would this extend into television when, if and as there were second private stations growing up, the same policies that have been applied by the CBC in sound?

MR. LUCAS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Including the withdrawal from local advertising where that would come into competition with local advertisers?

MR. LUCAS: I think I would express it this way: if we are going to take back, if it is going to cost a lot of money -- yes, it costs a lot of money but the private and publicly-owned stations in sound broadcasting have operated together now for some years, perhaps not particularly happy bedfellows, but they get along. They have achieved a remarkable state of perfection for which they have won prizes, and I think in the name of Canadian unity and culture we have to pay something if it is going to cost the country money to run a television station, more money even if you withdraw from the local advertising, I think we have to dedicate some of our resources and wealth to this sort of thing. I would say that you could withdraw and in some way finance -- we suggested something at the end of the brief whereby it may be financed, but I would say, yes, withdraw from local advertising.

MR. COYNE: Would you agree if it did not

withdraw for financial or other reasons, if the CBC in such circumstances continued to solicit and carry local advertising, that in those circumstances the argument of the CARTB in favour of an independent regulatory board would have more force?

THE CHAIRMAN: At the preliminary stage if it did not withdraw from local advertising and if it did have a second station springing up then you would not be able to say there was no competition?

MR. LUCAS: That is right. We made a sudden jump from local advertising to a separate regulatory body, and I would only say this, it may give the CARTB a bigger handle on the club to beat the drum. It would put the CBC in a position which it is not now in, and since our group is so interested in keeping the CBC we would prefer it not to take any step which is going to cause more friction than already exists, and I think if it stepped into local advertising there would be just one further and I think quite important cause because the local stations are privately owned and we know perfectly well they have to make money, and we have been stressing the point here, we are fully aware that these people are operating to make some money and we have no objection to that. If we had a CBC station here, as we say in our brief, we would not perhaps feel that it concerned us what programmes were available on CFRB; CFNB, as we say, fulfills its obligations as it sees fit, lots of clatter matter from 7.30 to 8.00 and so on, but I

notice by comparing their programmes that what CBA gives, there are certain programmes we like better. All we are saying in the brief, to go back to the point, is that we would like to have more CBC programmes. If we had two stations then CFNB could continue, as far as we are concerned, to play hill-billy music and so on, and that is all it does. Naturally it does give service but we like the CBC and we would like to have more of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lucas, I want to thank you for both preparing the brief and presenting it, and also for your group for joining you and presenting it with you.

We will resume again at as close to two-thirty as we can.

---Upon resuming at 2.30 p.m.

SUBMISSION OF
UNIVERSITE du SACRE-COEUR

Appearance:

Rév. Père L. Cormier

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have on the list is that of the Fredericton Council of Women, but I received a telegram this morning from Mrs. Baird which said that the brief would not be read this morning. Does that mean it is not to be read at all or is there anyone here who wishes to present this brief? Well, we will pass it over and proceed to the brief of the Universite du Sacre-Coeur to be presented by the Rev. Pere L. Comeau. Father Comeau, I am sorry to say I cannot speak to you in French that you would understand, but if you will present your brief in French fairly slowly I think I can follow it and Mr. Stewart also, and of course Mr. Turcotte can.

We will mark your brief to start with as Exhibit No. 150.

EXHIBIT NO. 150: Brief presented by Université du Sacré-Coeur.

(French follows)

Fredericton, le 25 juin 1956

UNIVERSITE SACRE-COEUR

THE CHAIRMAN: Next on the list we have the brief presented by l'Université Sacré-Coeur.

We will begin by marking this brief as exhibit 150. The brief will be read by Father Cormier.

FATHER CORMIER:

Monsieur le Président,
Messieurs les membres de la Commission,

Notre Université, il va de soi, s'intéresse vivement aux questions qui concernent la culture générale de notre population; elle s'intéresse du fait aux services de la Radio et de la Télévision.

Nous désirons donc nous faire l'interprète et le porte-parole de notre population française de la province du Nouvea-Brunswick et particulièrement de cette portion de la population qui réside dans les comtés nords du N.B.

Voici brièvement la situation;

La population française des comtés nords du N.B. forme un groupement important (chiffres du recensement 1951):

Comté de Northumberland: population française	- 12,978
Comté de Gloucester: population française	- 49,602
Comté de Restigouche: population française	- 24,132
	85,712

Or cette population française ne bénéficie pas encore des services de Radio Canada.

Nous nous sommes réjouis lors de l'érection du nouveau Poste français CBAF de Moncton; nos concitoyens du sud de la Province l'apprécient et en profitent. La population française du nord a été péniblement décue en constatant qu'elle ne peut capter les émissions de ce poste.

Nous sommes de l'avis du Rapport de la Commission Massey, que Radio-Canada doit contribuer à maintenir et développer la mentalité propre des Canadiens; c'est ce qui nous intéresse également au plus haut point.

La population acadienne malmenée par les circonstances de son histoire, a particulièrement besoin de cet aide pour lui permettre de garder sa langue et sa mentalité propre. Voilà pourquoi elle insiste en faveur d'un service auquel elle tient beaucoup. Depuis bientôt trente ans que Radio-Canada fonctionne, personne ne pourra raisonnablement soutenir que cette population a été favorisée; au contraire on doit dire qu'elle a été lamentablement négligée.

Heureusement qu'elle a pu profiter des émissions françaises du Poste privé CHNC de New Carlisle, P.Q.

Tout de même ce poste gaspésien ne saurait suffire aux besoins de la population française du N.B. Il y aurait grand avantage à ce que les diverses régions françaises du N.B. soient reliées au poste de base de Moncton. Un simple exemple: les programmes

scolaires émis à Moncton à l'adresse des élèves de langue française, seraient de nature à profiter à ceux du nord de la Province s'ils pouvaient être captés.

Non seulement nous manquons les programmes d'intérêt local pour les français du N.B., mais il nous est à peu près impossible d'y apporter nos contributions. Le poste CBAF de Moncton a déjà contribué au développement des talents locaux. Il y a des talents chez nous aussi; ce qui manque en ce moment c'est l'opportunité de les faire connaître et de les développer.

La Télévision

Ce que nous avons dit de la Radio s'applique encore plus à la Télévision; dans ce domaine c'est encore pour nous la carence complète.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de répéter des lieux communs sur ce sujet. C'est sans contredit un puissant moyen de formation ou de déformation selon ce que nous en ferons. Pour le moment on dit beaucoup de bien des programmes français de Montréal; Radio-Canada doit en être fier; mais il est regrettable que ces programmes réalisés à grands frais ne puissent être l'apanage d'un plus grand nombre d'auditeurs.

Recommandations

A la suite de ces quelques considérations,

vous nous permettrez Messieurs de vous faire modestement les recommandations suivantes, selon les voeux de la population française du nord du N.B.

1) L'érection d'un Poste de Radio, soit dans le comté de Gloucester soit dans le comté de Restigouche.

2) L'érection d'un Poste de Télévision ou d'un relais placé favorablement pour le bénéfice de la population française du nord du Nouveau-Brunswick.

Avec nos remerciements anticipés, veuillez agréer, Messieurs, l'hommage de notre parfaite considération.

Le Recteur ..HENRI.CORMIER.....

Le Secrétaire..A.L..LA.PLANTE.....

Au Président et aux Membres de la Commission Royale d'Enquête sur la Radio et la Télévision

LA FÉDÉRATION des Ligues du Sacré-Coeur du diocèse de Bathurst, Nouveau-Brunswick.

Désire souscrire aux recommandations qui se trouvent inscrites dans le présent rapport, fait à l'Université Sacré-Coeur de Bathurst, concernant la Radio et la Télévision.

Président: AZARIAS DOUCET

Secrétaire: A.R. POIRIER

Le 21 avril 1956.

Au Président et aux Membres de la Commission Royale d'Enquête sur la Radio et la Télévision.

Nous soussignés désirons faire nôtres les

recommandations qui se trouvent inscrites dans le présent rapport fait à l'Université Sacré-Coeur de Bathurst concernant la Radio et la Télévision.

Vos tout dévoués,

(AZARIAS DOUCET)
Surintendant des Ecoles du
Comté de Gloucester.

VINCENT GENDRON, B.A., M.D., D.P.H.

LIVAIN CORMIER, Secrétaire,
L'Association des Fermiers de
Gloucester et Restigouche.

GERALD CHIASSON,
Agronome

LA FÉDÉRATION DES CAISSES POPULAIRES ACADIENNES LTEE

CARAQUET, N.-B.

Messieurs,

Notre organisation, qui représente 60,000 sociétaires, désire souscrire entièrement aux recommandations que contient le Mémoire préparé par l'Université du Sacré-Coeur de Bathurst-Ouest.

Respectueusement,

ULYSSE GAUDET, Président,

MARTIN J. LÉGÈRE, Secrétaire.

Me DE GRANDPRE: Aux fins de compléter le dossier, pourriez-vous nous dire en quelques mots combien il y a d'élèves à l'Université Sacré-Coeur, quel est le personnel enseignant?

Père CORMIER: Le personnel enseignant est à peu près vingt-cinq prêtres et dix autres

et nous avons environs quatre cents élèves. Nous commençons au début de l'année avec quatre cents élèves qui demeurent à l'Université. Nous avons un Service d'Extension extérieur par des cercles d'études, les paroisses ...

Me de GRANDPRE: Vous êtes affiliés à l'Université Laval?

Père CORMIER: Non, nous ne sommes pas affiliés à l'Université Laval. Nous sommes indépendants, mais nous avons une entente avec l'Université que nos degrés sont reconnus tels quels, sans examen d'admission.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et les degrés que vous décernez sont des degrés de Bachelier ès-Arts et Bachelier ès-Sciences?

Père CORMIER: Bachelier ès-Arts surtout dans le moment, mais nous avons la Charte universitaire qui nous permet de décerner tous les degrés.

MONSIEUR TURCOTTE: Nous n'avons pas saisi le nombre d'élèves.

Père CORMIER: Quatre cents.

Me de GRANDPRE: Le but de toutes ces questions n'était pas de discréditer les représentations faites par le témoin qui présente le mémoire, mais simplement d'établir dans le dossier le nombre de personnes pour lesquelles le

témoin parle, et de toute façon est-ce que vous avez à la mémoire le nombre de membres, par exemple, des Fédérations du Sacré-Coeur qui, si je comprends bien, endossent le mémoire que vous présentez?

Père CORMIER: Cette Fédération, je crois qu'elle grouperait facilement ... je donne cela sans assurance ... près de trois mille membres.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et les représentations qui sont contenues dans votre mémoire ont-elles été soumises, croyez-vous, aux membres de la Fédération, ou si c'est une décision uniquement de l'Exécutif de la Fédération?

Père CORMIER: C'est plutôt une décision de l'Exécutif.

Me de GRANDPRE: Quant à la Fédération des Caisses Populaires, je vois qu'il y a soixante mille membres. Est-ce que vous croyez que les mêmes remarques s'appliquent quant à l'examen ou l'étude du rapport? Il s'agit encore de la décision de l'Exécutif.

Père CORMIER: D'une décision de l'Exécutif.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que les mêmes remarques s'appliquent ... est-ce que ces quatre personnes qui ont endossé le rapport l'ont

fait en leur qualité personnelle ou si elles ont agi en qualité de représentant officiel?

Père CORMIER: En raison de leurs fonctions officielles. Vous en avez un qui a signé comme Secrétaire de la Commission et monsieur Chiasson comme agronome.

Le COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Elle est nombreuse, cette Association des Fermiers?

Père CORMIER: L'Association des Fermiers ...

Me de GRANDPRE: Nous avons comme témoin suivant le représentant de l'Association. Nous pourrions peut-être et nous ferions alors aussi bien d'attendre.

Le COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Etant donné que vous êtes le premier témoin à nous parler de programmes français au Nouveau-Brunswick, pourriez-vous nous dire les proportions de la population de l'expression française au Nouveau-Brunswick?

Père CORMIER: Il y a à peu près quarante-huit pour cent de la population d'expression française ici au Nouveau-Brunswick.

Me de GRANDPRE: Ces chiffres sont basés sur les données du dernier recensement de 1951 ou si ce sont des chiffres à date?

Père CORMIER: 1951.

Me de GRANDPRE: Sur une population totale de cinq cent mille, quatre cent soixante-quinze mille en 1951?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que cette population d'environ quarante-huit pour cent est sensiblement la même quant aux trois comtés que vous mentionnez dans les trois premiers paragraphes de votre rapport ou si dans ces trois comtés ...

Père CORMIER: La population de Gloucester est de quatre vingt-six pour cent française. Celle de Restigouche est de soixante-six pour cent. Celle de Northumberland, je regrette, je ne peux pas vous la donner.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et d'après vos remarques, si cette partie du Nouveau-Brunswick était la plus populeuse, en fait, d'après vos remarques, elle est la plus populeuse, quant à la population française.

Père CORMIER: Il y a le comté de Madawaska qui est de quatre vingt-treize pour cent français.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que dans le comté de Madawaska il y a le même problème pour la Radio?

Père CORMIER: Oui, le même problème. Ils ne sont pas servis par Radio-Canada non

plus.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que je dois comprendre que les remarques que vous faites pour les trois comtés dans votre mémoire s'appliqueraient également à Madawaska?

Père CORMIER: Oui, c'est bien mentionné dans ce rapport, mais je crois qu'un rapport le mentionnait d'une façon spécifique, je crois que les remarques s'appliquent au comté de Madawaska.

Me de GRANDPRE: Quelle serait à peu près la limite extrême du service donné par CBAF en se dirigeant vers le nord?

Père CORMIER: En se dirigeant vers le nord on se rend à peine à soixante milles en dehors de Moncton, et Bathurst, qui est une distance d'environ cent vingt milles de Moncton ne prend pas CBAF, ou seulement dans des conditions extrêmement favorables.

Autrement dit, le poste de Moncton n'est pas pris dans la région de Bathurst, dans le comté de Gloucester et de Restigouche.

Me de GRANDPRE; Est-ce que ces comtés reçoivent des émissions françaises de quelque nature que ce soit?

Père CORMIER: On reçoit dans ces comtés-là des émissions du poste privé de New-

Carlisle.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que c'est une réception continuelle ou intermittente?

Père CORMIER: La réception est bonne, elle est continuelle.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et par l'entremise de ce poste à New-Carlisle, est-ce que vous recevez une partie des émissions du réseau français de Radio-Canada?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est un poste qui est affilié à la Radio française?

Père CORMIER: De Radio-Canada.

Me de GRANDPRE: De cette façon vous recevez tous les programmes français du réseau?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Qui sont transmis par le poste de New-Carlisle?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous pourriez nous indiquer dans quelle mesure il y a une différence ou une similitude entre les programmes provenant de Moncton et ceux provenant de New-Carlisle?

Père CORMIER: Les programmes qui proviennent de New-Carlisle sont des programmes qui sont plutôt choisis dans un intérêt gaspé-

sien. Ils sont d'un intérêt gaspésien et québécois. C'est pour le Québec avant tout. Ils considèrent seulement en deuxième lieu les Provinces Maritimes, et avec raison. C'est leur poste.

Maintenant les programmes que nous aurions de Moncton auraient un intérêt beaucoup plus intense pour nous, pour la région acadienne, parce qu'ils porteraient sur nos problèmes, sur notre mentalité, notre esprit, nos difficultés.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'à certain moment les programmes que CBAF donne sont identiques aux programmes qui sont produits sur le réseau français et transmis de New-Carlisle?

Père CORMIER: Avec Moncton?

Me de GRANDPRE: Oui.

Père CORMIER: Identiques à ceux de Moncton, il y en a quelques-uns certainement, mais la majorité, je ne pense pas.

Me de GRANDPRE: Il y a des programmes du réseau français qui originent de Montréal. Ne sont-ils pas transmis par Moncton avec référence locale ?

Père CORMIER: C'est-à-dire ceux de Montréal sont transmis à Moncton, oui, mais ils atteignent très peu de gens, très peu de la population française du Nouveau-Brunswick et des Maritimes.

Me de GRANDPRE: On ne se comprend pas. Ce que je veux savoir, c'est si vous trouvez une différence dans le genre de programmes qui sont transmis sur le réseau français à Moncton et les programmes qui sont transmis sur le réseau français disons à Rimouski et Chicoutimi?

Père CORMIER: Il y a une différence. Il y a un triage fait par chacun de ces postes-là.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est par le poste qui transmet le programme venant de Montréal?

Père CORMIER: Ceux de Moncton beaucoup plus. On pourrait prendre beaucoup plus de programmes par Moncton qu'on pourrait en prendre par New-Carlisle.

Me de GRANDPRE: Parce que New-Carlisle ne transmet les programmes du réseau que trois, quatre ou cinq heures par jour?

Père CORMIER: C'est cela.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et pendant cette période au cours de laquelle le poste de New-Carlisle transmet les programmes du réseau il y aurait un dédoublement?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que l'Université a fait par l'entremise de ses professeurs ou par l'entremise d'ingénieurs indépendants des

recherches même superficielles pour savoir combien ça prendrait de postes de relais pour couvrir intégralement le nord du Nouveau-Brunswick?

Père CORMIER: Non, on n'a fait aucun travail technique, aucune recherche technique sur ce point-là.

Me de GRANDPRE: Maintenant, savez-vous s'il y a eu des démarches qui ont été faites par des personnes du Nouveau-Brunswick d'expression française, de façon à monter un poste privé français dans le nord du Nouveau-Brunswick?

Père CORMIER: Il n'y a pas eu de démarches pour la fondation d'un poste privé français. Maintenant, Bathurst, il y a deux ans passés, a fondé un poste qui devait donner quarante pour cent de français. Or, dans le moment, il donne une valeur de trois minutes le matin, et de trois minutes le soir, et, d'après sa charte, il est tenu à quarante pour cent de français.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce que c'est d'après la charte ou d'après la licence du poste?

Père CORMIER: D'après sa charte.

Me de GRANDPRE: D'après sa charte?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est un poste pri-

vé, cela?

Père CORMIER: Un poste privé.

Me de GRANDPRE: A Bathurst même?

Père CORMIER: Oui, à Bathurst même.

Me de GRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il y a eu des représentations faites soit par des groupements du Nouveau-Brunswick ou par d'autres groupements pour faire respecter les obligations que le poste avait contractées?

Père CORMIER: Je ne crois pas qu'il y a eu de représentations faites dans le moment, parce qu'on comptait bien sur cette Commission pour remédier à cette situation, parce que nous, on comptait sur le service de Moncton, sur les relais de Moncton pour remédier à cette situation.

La fondation est un peu nouvelle. Le poste a été fondé seulement il y a deux ans à peine. On a toujours espoir qu'ils vont nous donner notre français. Ils ont promis continuellement de le faire, et à moins de représentations très fortes, d'après l'esprit actuel des directeurs, on peut s'attendre que les choses ne changeront pas tout de suite.

Me de GRANDPRE: Vous dites qu'il y a trois minutes le matin?

Père CORMIER: A peu près, c'est-à-

dire on donne cinq minutes officiellement pour les nouvelles, cinq minutes le soir aussi. Maintenant sur ces cinq minutes-là, on prend deux minutes pour l'annonce.

Me de GRANDPRE; Qui est faite en quelle langue?

Père CORMIER: En anglais.

Me de GRANDPRE: Quel est le pourcentage à peu près de la population française à Bathurst et dans les environs?

Père CORMIER: Le comté de Gloucester, c'est quatre vingt-six pour cent, et la ville de Bathurst, c'est environ soixante-cinq pour cent.

Me de GRANDPRE: Alors, ça serait bien difficile de ne pas tenir compte de la proportion de la population française desservie par le poste de Bathurst?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Ce que je ne peux pas comprendre, c'est que ce poste-là est un poste commercial, n'est-ce-pas?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est un poste qui a intérêt à servir la population?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et comment se fait-

il qu'au point de vue de pression économique seulement, il puisse continuer à opérer sans desservir soixante-dix pour cent de la population?

Père CORMIER: Je crois que vous touchez au nerf de la question actuellement. Il nous faut actuellement pour maintenir la survivance française dans notre région des postes qui vont éduquer, qui vont faire l'éducation française.

Or, c'est un fait que parmi cette population-là il y a un grand nombre de gens qui sont tout à fait indifférents.

Me de GRANDPRE: Indifférents au point d'écouter les programmes de langue anglaise ou d'écouter les programmes de langue française?

Père CORMIER: Oui, avec cette différence que, s'il y a un poste anglais à Bathurst, ils sont prêts à l'écouter. C'est l'anglais qui va tout simplement pénétrer dans ces foyers. Il y a des gens de langue française à tendance anglaise. C'est renversé. Ici on demande tout simplement des postes reliés à Radio-Canada. C'est pour donner ce souci de la survivance et pour renforcer un peu.

Me de GRANDPRE: Quand vous parlez de soixante, soixante-dix ou quatre-vingts pour cent de citoyens d'expression française, est-ce que ce sont des gens qui parlent couramment le français dans leurs affaires, à la maison et à l'école?

Père CORMIER: Oui, ce sont des gens qui parlent couramment le français et, à part peut-être quelques unités, comme dans la ville de Bathurst, par exemple, à Campbellton, ils sont plus portés à l'anglais. Il y a certains insouciants qui devraient être secoués.

Me de GRANDPRE: Parce que vous voyez le problème auquel on fait face. Le système actuel prévoit que Radio-Canada donne un service à travers le pays, ceci jusqu'aux Rocheuses, quant à la Radio française, avec l'aide de postes privés.

Père CORMIER: Oui.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et le problème que vous avez ici, à savoir de ne pas recevoir l'intégralité des programmes de radio française s'applique également à d'autres régions qui se plaignent de ne pas recevoir de la Radio française. Il y en a même qui se plaignent de ne pas recevoir de Radio anglaise. Est-ce que vous

ne croyez pas qu'il y aurait plus de facilités en forçant les postes privés à vous donner la proportion de français que vous désirez avoir? Est-ce que vous ne croyez pas que ceci serait préférable plutôt que de commencer à installer des postes de Radio-Canada à travers toutes les régions du pays?

Père CORMIER: Je pense que ceci ne profitera jamais. Parce que, d'abord, quarante pour cent, c'est déjà insuffisant, et ce quarante pour cent serait plus ou moins respecté. On sera toujours à grignoter sur ce quarante pour cent. On n'aura pas seize heures par jour, comme il est légitime de l'avoir des services de Radio-Canada.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est tout.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous ne vous êtes jamais adressé à Radio-Canada pour obtenir que Radio-Canada fasse certaines démarches auprès de ce poste privé pour qu'il observe les conditions de sa licence?

Père CORMIER: Je crois que le poste vient tout de même que de commencer, on n'a pas eu le temps.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE; Quand avez-vous eu le poste?

Père CORMIER: Ca fait un an et demi, je crois.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Maintenant, pouvez-vous écouter le poste de Campbellton?

Père CORMIER: Non, pas à Bathurst, Campbellton, c'est un poste exclusivement anglais.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Mais dans les propriétaires, je vois les noms de Houde, Dumont, Carette et Renaud?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Mais le principal actionnaire est monsieur Houde, qui a cinquante-neuf pour cent.

Père CORMIER: Oui, mais c'est un poste exclusivement anglais quand même.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Et Edmundston, encore moins?

Père CORMIER: Pas du tout. Le seul poste que nous puissions entendre dans la région, c'est New-Carlisle et Bathurst même.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Maintenant est-il dans votre mémoire ... Vous parlez en passant des programmes scolaires à monter à l'adresse des élèves de langue française. Vous dites qu'ils seraient de nature à profiter à ceux de la province, s'ils pouvaient être

copiés sur les programmes scolaires, vous dites que ces programmes scolaires sont une création du Ministère de l'Education du Nouveau-Brunswick.

Père CORMIER: Non, c'est le poste lui-même.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous êtes bien sûr de cela?

Père CORMIER: Je crois qu'ils sont organisés par le poste.

Me de GRANDPRE: Et c'est une contribution, je pense, à parties égales, entre le Département de l'Instruction publique du Nouveau-Brunswick et Radio-Canada. Je le pense.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous croyez que ça serait utile dans la région de Bathurst, si ces programmes-là étaient possibles?

Père CORMIER: Oui, parce qu'actuellement je sais que dans certaines écoles on a essayé d'attraper ces programmes à certains moments de la journée, et on n'a pas réussi. Parfois on peut réussir et parfois on ne réussit pas. On ne peut pas s'y fier.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE; Ces écoles sont de quelle nature? Ce sont des

écoles de la province ou des écoles séparées?

Père CORMIER: Ce sont des écoles de la province.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Ce sont des écoles de la province?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Mais où on enseigne le français?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Comme langue d'enseignement?

Père CORMIER: Oui, avec l'anglais, les deux.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Mais la langue française sert de simple truchement à l'enseignement.

Père CORMIER: En principe, maintenant nous avons encore des difficultés dans la préparation des instituteurs et des institutrices. L'anglais prime.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Comme langue d'enseignement?

Père CORMIER: Mais la langue d'enseignement est française.

LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: J'en conclus qu'il y a insuffisance d'instituteurs

de langue française.

Père CORMIER: Oui, ils sont obligés de se rendre à une Ecole Normale de langue anglaise. Ils n'ont pas la préparation voulue dans la langue française, telle qu'ils devraient avoir.

Me de GRANDPRE: C'est pour ça que les programmes scolaires de Radio-Canada seraient d'autant plus bienvenus que le problème est plus difficile?

Père CORMIER: Oui.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for bringing your brief and preparing it for us. We will break now for a few minutes.

---A short recess.

25 juin 1956.

L'Association Agricole du District Agronomique No. 3

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of l'Association Agricole du District Agronomique No 3, to be presented by Mr. Prosper Girouard and Mr. Gustave Gaudet.

We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 151.

EXHIBIT No. 151 : Brief presented by l'Association Agricole du district Agronomique No. 3.

M. PROSPER GIRARD: Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires. Notre association groupe dans ses rangs, les cultivateurs acadiens des comtés de Kent et Westmorland dans la province du Nouveau-Brunswick au nombre d'environ 4500.

Notre organisation a pour but : 1. d'étudier les problèmes relatifs au progrès de l'agriculture; 2. De travailler au développement de l'agriculture sous toutes formes au moyen de l'éducation, de la coopération et d'une législation favorable à l'agriculture; 3. D'avoir une organisation capable de parler en faveur et au nom de tous les cultivateurs de la région; 4. De s'affilier aux autres organisations similaires de la région ou de la province. Notre principal objectif, c'est donc l'éducation de nos membres sur les problèmes agricoles afin de leur permettre de retirer de leurs fermes, un revenu suffisant pour qu'ils puissent vivre convenablement eux et leurs familles. Pour arri-

ver à cette fin, il y a plusieurs moyens à notre disposition et la radio et la télévision sont parmi les plus puissants.

Notre association voudrait dès maintenant exprimer son appréciation de l'établissement du poste CBAF par la Société Radio-Canada à Moncton. Ce service, que la population apprécie de plus en plus de jour en jour, aurait à y gagner, d'après notre humble opinion, si l'on tenait plus compte du caractère agricole de la région, car après tout, la population française des comtés de Kent et Westmorland est surtout une population qui vit en campagne, qui tire sa vie principalement de la terre, de la forêt et de la mer pour ceux qui vivent le long du détroit de Northumberland. C'est donc dire, que cette population a besoin de programmes agricoles adaptés à la région.

L'émission du "Réveil Rural" qui passe sur nos ondes tous les jours au poste CBAF à cinq heures et trente de l'après-midi, ne répond pas aux besoins de la région, si excellent soit-il. Il importe de donner à notre population agricole un programme local confié à une personne compétente, connaissant bien les besoins de la région et la mentalité des gens auxquels il s'adresse. Cet expert, versé dans les problèmes agricoles, en contact journalier avec nos cultivateurs, nos associations agricoles, nos coopératives et nos caisses populaires, les cercles d'études, serait en mesure de faire passer sur les ondes de Radio-

Canada des émissions adaptées aux besoins de la population, toutes désignées pour promouvoir l'éducation populaire, disseminant en même temps, des conseils saisonniers, quantités de renseignements sur les marchés locaux, etc. Nous osons espérer que ce désir que nous exprimons ici, sera pris en sérieuse considération par la Société Radio-Canada et que dans un avenir très rapproché, le poste CBAF aura son commentateur agricole.

Tout en appréciant à sa juste valeur l'établissement à Moncton du poste radiophonique par la Société Radio-Canada, nous déplorons le fait que la puissance de ce poste est limitée et qu'au Nouveau-Brunswick, en Nouvelle-Ecosse, des groupes importants de gens de langue française ne peuvent pas capter aucune émission en langue française. Nous voulons signaler en particulier la région de Fredericton, Minto et Saint-Jean au Nouveau-Brunswick, et la région connue sous le nom de la Baie Sainte-Marie, en Nouvelle-Ecosse. Connaissant les sentiments qui animent la Société Radio-Canada, nous voulons ici formuler le voeu, que très prochainement, l'établissement de relais permettra à toutes les personnes habitant les régions cinommées, d'entendre et d'apprécier les programmes du réseau français de Radio-Canada.

Notre association apprécie à sa juste valeur l'essor donné au développement de la télévision au Canada depuis 1952 et, tout en tenant compte du coût élevé de la production, elle conçoit que la consé-

quence de ce coût élevé a amené la centralisation dans les grands centres. Mais, par ailleurs, il faut souligner ici que notre province, qui est la plus bilingue du Canada, ne jouit pas encore de service de télévision en langue française. Par conséquent, notre association accepte en principe que, dans les milieux bilingues, le corps régissant la télévision autorise l'établissement d'au moins deux postes de télévision, dont l'un de langue anglaise et l'autre de langue française et ose demander que le plus tôt possible, le réseau français s'étende jusqu'aux Provinces Maritimes, par voie de micro-ondes et que, en attendant que les Maritimes soient reliées directement à la télévision française provenant de Montréal par micro-ondes, la Société Radio-Canada installe à CBA F un émetteur de télévision pour diffuser les émissions françaises enregistrées sur film.

Comme conclusion à cet exposé, notre association recommande:

a) le maintien de la régie par un bureau des Gouverneurs de la Société Radio-Canada responsable au Parlement canadien;

b) le maintien du présent statut des postes privés par rapport à la Société Radio-Canada;

c) tenant compte de l'importance de la radio et de la télévision dans le développement culturel de la population, et même dans l'économie générale du pays, notre association recommande que les fonds nécessaires soient assurés pourla mise en

oeuvre d'un système de diffusion, excellent par la qualité des émissions et par la satisfaction qu'il donne aux deux principaux groupes ethniques du pays.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Girouard.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, toujours pour établir dans quelle proportion celui qui présente le mémoire représente l'Association; je vois que votre association compte 4500 membres?

M. GUSTAVE GUADET: Oui, monsieur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous pourriez nous dire comment le mémoire a été préparé? Est-ce qu'il a été préparé par l'exécutif?

M. GAUDET: Par l'exécutif.

Me deGRANDPRE: Soumis aux membres avec corrections et, finalement, soumis dans sa forme définitive, ou s'il a été seulement soumis aux membres pour approbation?

M. GAUDET: Soumis aux membres pour approbation, à une assemblée semi-annuelle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Il y avait combien de membres?

M. GAUDET: Il y avait une centaine de délégués.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que c'était la

première fois que vous présentiez un mémoire de ce genre-ci ou si vous en aviez présenté un à la Commission Massey?

M. GAUDET: C'est la première fois.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans quelle mesure ce mémoire a-t-il été appuyé par les délégués? Est-ce que ç'a été une décision unanime ou une décision majoritaire?

M. GAUDET: Il a été approuvé unanimement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Etes-vous satisfait que le mémoire représente l'opinion des 4500 membres?

M. GAUDET: On ne les a pas consultés un à un; mais en général je pense que tous nos membres, tous nos cultivateurs acadiens des comtés de Kent et Westmorland approuvent ce mémoire-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, ce mombre de 4500, est-ce que ça représente le foyer familial ou si ça représente tous les membres de la famille qui font partie de l'association? Je veux savoir si seulement le chef de famille fait partie de l'Association ou si, par le fait que le chef de famille en fait partie, les enfants en font partie?

M. GAUDET: Le nombre de 4500 représenterait à peu près les cultivateurs acadiens qui vivent dans les comtés de Kent et Westmorland. C'est le

nombre de fermes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que les familles font partie automatiquement de l'Association?

M. GAUDET: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Il s'agit là d'une association absolument bénévole ou si c'est une association à laquelle les fermiers contribuent de leurs deniers?

M. GAUDET: Ils contribuent une contribution annuelle.

Me deGRANDPRE: De combien?

M. GAUDET: De un dollar par membre.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez un personnel rémunéré?

M. GAUDET: Non. Nous avons à peu près mille membres qui paient leur cotisation.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais vous n'avez pas de secrétariat permanent?

M. GAUDET: Non, monsieur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous mentionnez que les programmes qui ont trait à l'agriculture sont entendus sur CBAF, mais qu'ils sont d'intérêt trop général?

M. GAUDET: Oui, monsieur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Y a-t-il des programmes qui sont entendus sur CBAF qui s'adressent à la région des Maritimes?

M. GAUDET: En agriculture?

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui.

M. GAUDET: Très rarement. Il y a eu quelques émissions locales de quinze minutes, comme des entrevues, par exemple.

Me deGRANDPRE: Le seul programme agricole qu'il y ait sur les ondes de Moncton, c'est le Réveil Rural?

M. GAUDET: En autant que je sache.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas des programmes qui s'adressent aux pêcheurs des Maritimes, soit pour la distribution des produits, etc.?

M. GAUDET: Je crois que c'est tout compris dans le Réveil Rural.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez fait des représentations au directeur général ou au directeur régional, pour lui demander d'avoir un programme qui soit plus adapté aux besoins de la région?

M. GAUDET: On a fait des représentations pour demander un commentateur agricole.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quelle a été la réponse

qu'on vous a faite?

M. GAUDET: C'est qu'on était pour considérer la question sérieusement.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est une demande qui a été faite quand?

M. GAUDET: Il y a à peu près deux ans, presque.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est toujours à l'étude?

M. GAUDET: Oui, toujours à l'étude.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Où avez-vous adressé la demande; à Moncton ou Ottawa?

M. GAUDET: La demande a été faite au gérant du poste, monsieur Huard, qui était là .

Me deGRANDPRE: Monsieur Huard est parti

M. GAUDET: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne savez pas si le problème est encore là ?

M. GAUDET: On a fait des représentations aussi ce printemps, à monsieur Hamelin et un autre monsieur de Radio-Canada. On leur en a parlé de nouveau.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais vous êtes toujours

restés au niveau local vous n'avez jamais fait de représentations écrites au bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada?

M. GAUDET: Non.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: C'était une représentation verbale à monsieur Huard?

M. GAUDET: Oui. Je pense qu'il y a eu une lettre qui a été envoyée par le secrétaire de l'Association qui était là avant moi, d'après une motion qui a été passée à une assemblée des cultivateurs de la région.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais votre dossier n'indique aucune représentation écrite?

M. GAUDET: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et d'après vous, il faudrait un agronome attaché au poste pour préparer un programme de cette nature-là?

M. GAUDET: Je pense que ce serait l'idéal.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, ce programme tel que vous l'entrevoyez serait un programme qui durerait combien de temps? Un quart d'heure par jour, une demi-heure par jour?

M. GAUDET: Il pourrait facilement aller à une demi-heure, pour remplacer le Réveil Rural, avec les cotations des prix du marché.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans votre esprit, le programme en question remplacerait le Réveil Rural; il ne le complèterait pas?

M. GAUDET: Oui, il le remplacerait.

Me deGRANDPRE: Complètement?

M. GAUDET: C'était l'idée de demander un programme adapté à notre région. On a beaucoup de termes qu'on emploie dans le programme du Réveil Rural qui ne sont pas compris par nos cultivateurs français du Nouveau-Brunswick.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous ne croyez pas qu'il y a avantage à avoir un programme national qui s'adresse aussi bien aux cultivateurs de l'Ouest, de l'Ontario et du Québec qu'à ceux des Maritimes?

M. GAUDET: L'agriculture n'est pas la même à travers tout le Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Il y a certains problèmes qui sont différents?

M. GAUDET: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas des problèmes en commun?

M. GAUDET: Nos problèmes ne sont pas les problèmes des cultivateurs de blé de l'Ouest et ne sont pas ceux des cultivateurs de Niagara. Ca

serait pratique sur une plus petite échelle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que je dois comprendre par vos remarques, que le Réveil Rural, qui est un programme agricole national, n'a pratiquement pas sa raison d'être et qu'il serait remplacé avec avantage par un programme régional pour les Maritimes, un autre programme régional pour Québec, un autre pour l'Ontario et un autre pour l'Ouest?

M. GAUDET: Bien, pour répondre à cette question-là, je crois que les cultivateurs de langue française de l'Ouest n'acceptent pas entièrement le programme du Réveil Rural tel quel, parce qu'ils disent que ça ne fait pas leur affaire.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est pour cela que je pose la question; parce que nous avons eu des représentations dans l'Ouest, à St-Boniface et à Saskatoon, que les programmes, non pas seulement les programmes agricoles mais d'autres programmes du réseau, ne sont pas adaptés aux besoins de la région ou sont, à certains moments, inaccesssibles aux gens de la région parce qu'ils n'avaient pas évolué dans le même sens que les cultivateurs d'ailleurs, et que chaque région a sa mentalité propre; et vous êtes d'accord que les remarques qu'on nous a faites à ce moment-là, à l'effet qu'il y aurait avantage à régionaliser, si vous voulez, les programmes qui sont des programmes d'intérêt immédiat, comme le Réveil Rural?

M. GAUDET: Oui, c'est mon opinion.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Cependant, ce programme du Réveil Rural comprend aussi des chants, du folklore, de la musique avec, entre chaque chant, des causeries sur l'agriculture, un peu d'Histoire du Canada. C'est un programme complet. Est-ce que les gens de la région ne s'intéressent pas à ce programme en entier? Il est intéressant en tant que programme.

M. GAUDET: Oui. On conçoit qu'il est très intéressant, mais au point de vue agricole il n'est pas tout à fait adapté à l'agriculture du Nouveau-Brunswick, de nos centres français. On cite aussi les prix du marché de Montréal; tandis qu'on a un marché à Moncton qui pourrait être donné; c'est plus proche de nous.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous N'êtes pas absolument contre, mais vous voudriez le réadapter en laissant tout ce qui est national dans le programme, comme la musique, les commentaires d'ordre général et l'Histoire, mais que les problèmes qui sont spécifiquement des problèmes d'agriculture soient discutés sur une base régionale?

M. GAUDET: Ce serait correct.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais, d'un autre côté, est-ce que vous ne trouvez pas qu'en laissant un programme national comme celui-là, vous ne faites pas un effort pour unir tout le monde d'un bout à l'autre du pays pour que vous compreniez les problèmes du

fermier de l'Ouest qui ne sont pas les vôtres; mais que vous sachiez qu'il a un problème lui aussi, et que vous n'êtes pas les seuls à avoir des problèmes?

M. GAUDET: Je comprends ça. Je pense qu'il y aurait tout de même d'autres moyens probablement de garder les agriculteurs en bonnes relations les uns avec les autres, à part d'avec le programme du Réveil Rural.

Me deGRANDPRE: Au lieu de vouloir mettre de côté le Réveil Rural pour le remplacer par un programme régional, est-ce qu'il n'y aurait pas avantage à plutôt ajouter un programme d'intérêt local au programme national, laisser les deux ensemble de façon à combler le vide qui existerait sur le plan national, si vous enleviez le Réveil Rural?

M. GAUDET: Ca prendrait un homme quand même.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est juste pour voir jusqu'à quel point vous allez dans cette modification de la charpente du programme et, d'après ce que je vois, vous êtes en faveur de garder le thème national du programme et d'y ajouter quelque chose qui s'adapte plus particulièrement à votre région?

M. GAUDET : Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, pour toucher un problème un peu plus général. Dans vos conclusions, vous concluez comme ceci:

a) le maintien de la régie par un bureau des Gouverneurs de la Société Radio-Canada responsable au Parlement canadien;

b) le maintien du présent statut des postes privés par rapport à la Société Radio-Canada.

Pouvez-vous dire si vous avez particulièrement étudié ce problème du maintien du statut des postes privés par rapport à la Société Radio-Canada ou si, dans l'ensemble, ça vous semble assez satisfaisant, à l'heure actuelle?

M. GAUDET: On n'a pas fait d'étude spéciale, mais l'ensemble nous paraît satisfaisant tel qu'il est.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce qui vous porte à adopter ce point de vue, c'est qu'il y a plus de facilité à obtenir du français en vous adressant à Radio-Canada qu'en vous adressant aux postes privés?

M. GAUDET: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous parlez également, un peu plus bas, du coût de financement de Radio-Canada. Pouvez-vous dire si votre groupe a discuté des possibilités de remettre en vigueur la licence sur les appareils récepteurs?

M. GAUDET: Cette question-là n'a pas été étudiée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez pas discuté

de ce problème-là dans ses détails?

M. GAUDET: Non.

Me deGRANDPRE: Pas plus que vous avez discuté les avantages et les inconvénients de garder la taxe d'accise sur les appareils récepteurs et les pièces de rechange?

M. GAUDET: Non.

M. LE COMMISSAIRE TURCOTTE: Vous proposez quelque part, vous recommandez que Radio-Canada installe à CBAF un émetteur de télévision pour diffuser les émissions françaises enregistrées sur films. Savez-vous s'il existe un canal de télévision disponible à Moncton?

M. GAUDET: Non, monsieur.

M. TURCOTTE: Je crois être informé qu'à Moncton il n'en existe plus. Mais à vrai dire, il existe très peu de canaux au Nouveau-Brunswick. Je parle seulement de canaux de haute fréquence, U.A.F. Ultra High Frequency. Le résultat n'est pas très bon. Advenant le cas où la Société Radio-Canada voudrait vous donner un poste de télévision de langue française, il serait difficile de trouver un canal et même alors, il ne desservirait qu'une région. Ne croyez-vous pas plutôt qu'un poste puissant de radio vous donnera un meilleur résultat, à toutes fins pratiques?

M. GAUDET: La radio et la télévision

ne sont pas la même chose.

M. TURCOTTE: Croyez-vous que la télévision va empiéter tellement, dans un avenir prochain, sur la radio, que la radio sera de moins en moins écoûtée; de sorte qu'un placement de capital de Radio-Canada dans ce domaine-là sera en quelque sorte un placement à fonds perdus, parce que le public se tourne de plus en plus vers la télévision?

M. GAUDET: D'après les chiffres, on dit qu'il y a des centaines de mille appareils de télévision qui sont vendus; c'est parce que les gens laissent la radio pour la télévision.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous croyez donc que le public s'éloigne de la radio pour se tourner vers la télévision?

m. GAUDET: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE: Et dans le jour aussi bien que le soir?

M. GAUDET: Nous autres, à Moncton, on prend la télévision de Moncton. Ca commence l'après-midi; et le soir, partout, on regarde la télévision et on ferme les appareils de radio.

M. TURCOTTE: Advenant le cas où Radio-Canada se rende à votre désir d'installer un poste de télévision et mettre un émetteur de radio, Radio-Canada court quand même le risque de faire un placement inutile puisque le public se tourne vers la télévision,

et que, pour la télévision, il y a très peu de canaux disponibles dans la province?

M. GAUDET: C'est difficile à répondre.

Me deGRANDPRE: A plusieurs endroits à travers le pays on nous a fait la remarque que les programmes éducatifs de Radio-Canada n'étaient pas écoutés et que c'était de l'argent jeté à l'eau, dépensé inutilement, si vous voulez. Quelle est votre opinion, après en avoir causé avec les membres de votre association? Est-ce que vous croyez que les programmes éducationnels et les programmes de bonne musique sont écoutés par les fermiers de votre région?

M. GAUDET: Je pourrais vous dire que je ne crois pas qu'ils soient autant écoutés qu'ils devraient l'être. Je laisserai répondre monsieur Girouard.

M. GIROUARD: Je croirais que oui. J'ai même entendu parler de la bonne musique; j'ai même entendu des gens de langue anglaise dire qu'ils écoutent CBAF parce qu'il y a de la bonne musique.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous avez déjà tenté de faire un relevé de la proportion de vos gens qui écoutaient les programmes éducatifs?

M. GIROUARD: Je n'ai jamais calculé.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce le fait d'une minorité ou d'une majorité d'écouter les programmes éducatifs de Radio-Canada?

M. GIROUARD: Je ne puis répondre.

M. GAUDET: Je peux vous répondre que dans nos comtés de Kent et Westmorland, le poste français de Radio-Canada est écouté dans une forte proportion depuis son érection à Moncton.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce dû principalement au fait que c'est un poste français ou est-ce dû au fait que les programmes sont de qualité supérieure?

M. GAUDET: Pour la région de Kent, je dirais que c'est grâce au fait que c'est français.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce qui attire les auditeurs, ce n'est pas tant la qualité des programmes comme l'expression française des programmes?

M. GAUDET: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE: Dans l'Ouest on nous a fait observer qu'il y avait plusieurs postes de langue française qui sont des postes privés et qui reçoivent des programmes de Radio-Canada, et de chacun d'entre eux nous avons entendu dire que non seulement ces postes atteignent leur auditoire de langue française, mais qu'en général ils doublent leur auditoire avec des auditeurs de langue anglaise, à cause de la qualité des programmes. Dans le cas de CBAF, est-ce qu'il y a beaucoup de citoyens de langue anglaise qui écoutent ce poste?

M. GIROUARD: Je puis vous dire qu'il

y en a. Quant au nombre, je ne sais pas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for presenting your brief.

SUBMISSION OF
NEW BRUNSWICK FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Appearances:

Mr. Lloyd Sloat

Mr. Alphonse Arsenault

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sloat, I understand you have Mr. Arsenault with you. We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 152.

EXHIBIT NO. 152: Brief of New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you understand our procedure here. You have been here during part of the day at least, and we ask you to present the brief and then we ask questions on the brief for the purpose of bringing out the exact meaning and putting various phases of the inquiry to you for your opinion.

MR. ARSENAULT: The New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture, representing some 10,000 farm families, welcomes and appreciates this opportunity to present its considered views on radio broadcasting and television, a matter of considerable importance to rural areas. No other segment of the Canadian people is so dependent on these two modern means of mass communication for news, market information, weather reports, religious programmes, views on national affairs and numerous other services including entertainment which can best be provided

by a national broadcasting system as it exists today.

The officers of the New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture, together with other farm groups across Canada, represented in the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, have already agreed on a statement of policy regarding Radio and Television broadcasting for presentation to this Commission.

The New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture, on behalf of rural people in this province, again endorses the submission of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, particularly with reference to supporting the present system which provides that there shall be only one national system for broadcasting, as a public service to the people of Canada and that in this system the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation shall maintain its present regulatory functions with privately-owned radio stations operating in a controlled capacity and on a community basis.

Privately-operated stations have from time to time and particularly through their national organization known as the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, made representations for the establishment of a separate regulatory board, under which,they maintain, two systems of broadcasting can receive equal treatment.

Present legislation does not provide for two systems but"a single national authority to control all broadcasting in the public interest." In effect, a compromise was obtained based on cooperation between

publicly-owned and private stations. In practice, and by law, Canada today is enjoying one overall system created by Parliament in 1932 and recognized and strengthened ever since by recommendations of successive Parliamentary Committees of which there were some fourteen.

There is therefore no point in setting up a separate regulatory body. This would simply mean that trained personnel and facilities now already in existence in the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would only have to be duplicated and with just this much additional cost to the country. In addition, any separate regulatory body which might be set up would not be familiar with the day to day operation of a radio and television system and thus would not be in as good a position as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to provide technical service.

Statements made from time to time by private broadcasters and their spokesmen have been all too general in nature and little evidence has been given as to how such a separate regulatory body might improve service to listeners or to viewers, particularly to rural areas where scattered population would not likely provide sufficient revenue to give satisfactory service. A separate regulatory board envisages that private stations intend to provide identical services to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Do these private stations intend to do this? Will they operate national and regional networks and accept specific service

responsibility as does the CBC? How would all this be financed? If a two-system idea is to be considered, can Canada afford it? Who would pay and how much? How would the listener and viewer benefit or receive services not provided by the present single system?

The cost of maintaining a standard of programmes suitable to Canadian listeners and viewers is staggering. This is where, according to Maclean's Magazine --

> "Private stations' organization is less precise in its undertaking to share the burden of providing Canadian TV programme. In radio, their record in this respect was found by the Massey Commission to be extremely poor and 'some of the wealthiest of the private stations have the lowest standard in programmes and show serious neglect of their obligations as parts of the national system."

There is some unanimity on one fundamental question which has not been altered since 1929 when the Aird report made the most significant observation that "Canadian radio listeners want Canadian broadcasting. In a country of the vast geographical dimensions of Canada, broadcasting will undoubtedly become a great force in fostering a national spirit and interpreting national citizenship."

That the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is aware at all times of its responsibilities at the national level is shown by the establishment, at Moncton, of a French radio station, CBAF, the only CBC owned French radio station east of Quebec. Dependent up to that time on Quebec French radio programmes, or on the local English radio station which could not be expected to give but occasional French broadcasts, the rural French-speaking population is grateful to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for providing them with regular broadcasts in their own language. Excellent programmes, often with local talents, have originated at CBAF with a notable exception which we would take the liberty of briefly outlining here as it is of the utmost importance to farm people of the area.

CBC farm broadcasts have attained a standard which is unequalled elsewhere. This is particularly true of the French farm broadcast originating in Montreal under the title "Le reveil rural", which we understand is the oldest sustained programme of its kind in Canada. This programme of unchallenged value to Quebec, is rebroadcasted generally without any modifications, through CBAF. This is of practically no value whatsoever to the farmers of the area for two main reasons: due to the time factor, "Le Reveil Rural" which is put out in Quebec during the noon hour, the best time for farm broadcast, would be heard an hour later at Moncton if used as a live programme. It is recorded and used by CBAF, from

5.30 to 5\45 in the afternoon when farmers are generally still occupied at their daily labour or doing their barn chores. A second reason of major importance is that no degree of excellency in a farm broadcast can replace a programme prepared for an area which is at such a distance as the one mentioned and for a group of the same race, it is true, but living in a totally different environment. Recognizing also that the rural population is still deprived of the same educational facilities found in large centres, every care should be taken to use words and expressions which are intelligible to them. It would not be proper at this time to enter into a lengthy discourse on the relative merits of repeatedly using multi-syllable words on non-receptive earsrums, but the fact remains that to be useful information must be available at the convenient time and be readily digested.

It will readily be seen that a regular farm broadcast should be initiated locally at CBAF under the direction of a person thoroughly familiar with the conditions and needs of agriculture in the area. This programme, primarily addressed to agricultural producers, should be so arranged that commercial fishermen, including part-time farmers and fishermen, would receive a fair share of attention.

May we take a few more moments to insert here, on behalf of the French-speaking members of

the Federation, a request that consideration be given at an early date to the establishment of a sister station to CBAF for French television programmes. The Parliamentary Committee of 1953 on broadcasting stated:

> "Your committee is convinced that television is going to play a very important part in Canadian life and that it must be developed in such a way so as to be of benefit to Canadians as individuals and to this nation as a whole."

The importance of television to rural people cannot be over-estimated and we feel sure that the motives which prompt the establishment of CBAF at Moncton will again be allowed to operate as satisfactorily.

From time to time it has been brought to the attention of our Federation that in certain areas, notably the Upper Saint John River Valley area, farmers are not now well served by the valuable CBC noon hour Farm Markets Broadcast, as well as the Farm Radio Forum Monday night programme. It is therefore urged that consideration be given to extending these and other CBC special services to such areas.

We now return to the matter directly under consideration with a statement made by the Maritime Federation of Agriculture in its presentation on radio broadcasting in 1949. The brief

stated:

"The maintenance and strengthening of the present system of radio control:

1. Can bring about the further development of our own Canadian nationality, customs and culture and

2. Provide a check on present expanding commercialism of radio and a greater emphasis on the public interest."

Under the present system, private stations have prospered and many also have provided community services which are of outstanding value. This is particularly true of assistance given various groups in developing their local programmes. However, let us not overlook the fact that these local farm organization programmes, although of great value, cannot replace such regional and national programmes as Farm Market broadcasts and Farm Radio Forum. One other important point is that in the United States, under private operation of radio, nearly all farm broadcasts have been pushed out of the desirable noon hour period by commercial programmes which are more lucrative. (Taken from the C.F.A. Brief on National Radio presented to the Massey Commission in 1949.) This was also the case at Moncton, when the local private station had a farm broadcast which until its demise had been assigned to the early morning period from six to seven o'clock.

In concluding this brief, which, due to

limit of time and other factors, is not intended to cover all aspects of the question, the views of the rural people of New Brunswick cannot be expressed more clearly than in the following resolutions approved at the 1949 annual meeting of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture and later included in the C.F.A. brief on national radio presented in 1949 by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture to the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

"1. That the Canadian Federation of Agriculture re-affirm its previously announced policy of supporting the present set-up of radio in Canada as being in the interests of the people at large; and strongly oppose any interference or change in the present set-up of the public corporation.

2. That we commend the CBC for the development of valuable types of programmes, such as the school broadcasts, the farm forum, the citizens' forum, commentary programmes, and unprejudiced news broadcasts and other educational and entertainment features of a high class, and that we also commend those private stations who cooperate with the CBC in developing and broadcasting such types of programmes, and who develop similar types of programmes for their own communities;

3. That while we recognize the need for advertising revenues, we sincerely deplore the growing tendency towards over-commercialization of radio;

4. That we strongly urge upon the public authority to resist all efforts of private interests to establish networks of their own which could result in greater exploitation of radio for private gain, but would also give such interests undue control over mediums of influencing public opinion;

5. That we urge upon the public authority the importance of having representation for Canadian agriculture on the Board of Governors of the public broadcasting system, such representation to be appointed in consultation with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture."

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Arsenault. Mr. Sloat, do you wish to add anything at the present time?

MR. SLOAT: I think Mr. Arsenault has covered the subject very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have the questions. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Arsenault, you say at the outset:

> "The New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture, representing some ten thousand farm families . . ."

Could you tell us a little about how the Federation

of Agriculture is made up?

MR. ARSENAULT: Certainly. The New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture is a Federation of all agricultural producers of the province. It also includes direct membership fees, in other words, there are members who pay directly through their local organization and to their district organization and to the provincial organization. For instance, the previous brief was presented by one of our member groups, District No. 3, which includes French-speaking families of Kent, Westmorland and Albert.

MR. COYNE: They are a local subsidiary of your Federation?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes. In other words, the provincial Federation includes the district Associations and most of the districts cover a county and the district is subdivided into a local organisation which may be cultural societies, farm forums, cooperatives and buying clubs and about ten or twelve local organizations may form to be the district association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you also have in the Federation some membership, as I think the Prince Edward Island Farm Federation do, of other provincial-wide organizations such as the New Brunswick Dairymen's Association or the New Brunswick Potato Growers' Association?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes, we have the New Brunswick Cream Producers' Association, the Poultry Producers and so forth. It is a provincial-wide organization of about ten thousand farm families.

That is the membership, it may be a few off or on. We do not take into consideration, for instance, the New Brunswick Cream Producers' organization, we do not include that as a total membership; some of them may be through a buying club, but actually here we represent ten thousand farm families.

MR. COYNE: That is, these are your individual memberships or the number of families who in one way or another are members of the Association?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I am curious about the figures. You claim ten thousand farm families and District No. 3 claims about forty-five hundred. Does that mean there are only fifty-five hundred in the whole of the rest of the province?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, there are in New Brunswick 26,000 farms. Now, the ideal thing would be to have 26,000 members in the Federation. Actually what we claim here is the actual number of farm families members of the Association, the others will eventually come in, we hope.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to say in summary of the point you are putting across in your brief that you support the present structure of broadcasting in Canada?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: You want to see it preserved; you do not want to see it changed?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right, that all attempts to change it along the lines that have been

suggested should be resisted.

MR. COYNE: Reverting for the moment to the matter of the Federation's organization, could you tell us briefly in what manner this brief was prepared?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Was it -- was the idea embodied in it ever submitted to the membership or the conventions?

MR. ARSENAULT: Not to the membership at large, but the brief was studied at length at the board meeting of the Federation of Agriculture at which eleven Federations representing all areas of the province were present. That would represent most of the counties so our directors who studied it and approved it unanimously actually came from all rural farming areas of New Brunswick and were speaking for their areas. But this has not been taken down to the local membership for study; simply approved by the directors of the different areas.

MR. COYNE: Did your Federation present a brief to the Massey Commission on radio and television?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, I would say here that the New Brunswick Federation took form in 1954; it replaces the New Brunswick Farmers' Association and it is only since 1954 the farmers of this province have had a permanent secretary. Before 1954 the organization did not have sufficient funds to pay a secretary or have an office.

MR. COYNE: So your Federation has not previously presented a brief to anyone on this subject?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to ask you a question about the quotation at the bottom of the page where you say:

"Present legislation does not

provide for two systems but 'a single national authority to control all broadcasting in the public interest.'"

Can you tell me where that quotation is from? I do not think it is from the legislation itself.

MR. ARSENAULT: I prepared the brief some time ago and my memory is not too clear on this point. I am sure I would have had it here if I had time, but from memory ---

THE CHAIRMAN: The way it reads it sounds as if you were quoting from the statute itself.

MR. ARSENAULT: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: I doubt if that is the fact.

MR. ARSENAULT: No, it is not, because I do not recall it in the statute.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it matters except when you use a quotation we like to know where it comes from. My suggestion might be/it was either in one of the previous Royal Commission Reports or one of the Parliamentary Committee Reports.

MR. ARSENAULT: I was going to say I believe it is from one of the Parliamentary reports.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you could let us have it if it is convenient to you?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes, I will.

MR. COYNE: On page 2 near the top you are referring to the separate regulatory body and you say:

"This would simply mean that trained personnel and facilities now already in existence in the Canadian

Broadcasting Corporation would only have to be duplicated and with just this much additional cost to the country."

Would it not be possible that there would not be so much duplication of personnel costs but a transfer of certain of the operations in the regulatory field that are now being carried on by the CBC to another group; would it necessarily be duplication, and, therefore, additional costs?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, actually we have a body -- the reasoning behind this was this, we have a body that is doing a certain amount of work and has a certain amount of control. The claim is sometimes given that the control is not exercised to the extent it should be, but that is beside the point; actually this body today is having a certain amount of control and by setting up another body we are duplicating the work which is done today by the CBC.

MR. COYNE: Except that the first body would no longer be doing the work?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes, but also you may be right on this one point but also there is the point that the programming enters the picture.

MR. COYNE: Do you emphasize this question of cost as being the primary, or one of the primary reasons, why you are against this independent regulatory body?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, the cost would not be so important in our minds against a separate

regulatory body. It is an important factor but the main point is that we have an organization doing that work today and it is exercising a certain amount of control over advertising and a type of programme and so forth and this apparently seems to be in effect an effort or an attempt to weaken the controls which are being exercised with a certain amount of laxity today -- perhaps that is not the right word.

MR. COYNE: But you would be against it for that reason primarily rather than for the fact that it might involve some cost for reasons of duplication which you set forth?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: On page 3 you are referring to the establishment of CBAF, and in particular to the matter of farm broadcasts in French in connection with the time at which Le Reveil Rural is heard in Moncton. Have you ever made any submissions to them to have it changed to a better time?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, the previous submissions of District No. 3 mentioned the effort which had been made to have both time and type of programme altered.

MR. COYNE: I followed him on the type of programme but I did not realize he spoke of the time, and I do not think he did.

MR. ARSENAULT: No, but I think he would support me on this; when the representations were made, if not all the representations, the letter which was

sent out by the previous secretary mentioned both time and also type of programme.

MR. COYNE: I see. The two factors were included within the representations that were made?

MR. ARSENAULT: Of course, if you would allow me I would like to put emphasis on the type of programme matter; the time factor I am not prepared to discuss. I am not qualified to say if the time factor is secondary. The most important thing is the programme is not suitable to the area, to the farmers, and I would say also that at the present time not suitable to the farmers -- French-speaking farmers -- of Moncton, and if whenever CBAF would be enlarged to take over French-speaking areas that the type of programme would also not be suitable for them.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say even if you could change the time you would still say that the type of programme is not suitable?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Now, we have heard it suggested in various parts of the country, including the Maritimes, that the primary function of the CBC is a national one, to present national programmes, with a view to developing national unity and understanding between the different areas and that the provision of local programmes is not a primary purpose of the CBC. Do you disagree with that general proposition that has been put to us?

MR. ARSENAULT: Not completely, but I

would like to add this, that one of the functions -- the way I understand -- of the CBC is an educational one, a very important one, and it seems to me that in New Brunswick here, especially around Moncton, that this function stands out as one of its most important ones for the rural people of the area. Now, the programming as it is today is to my mind, and I have spoken to a few farmers and asked them their reactions, and it is practically of no value because basically the problems are the same, but there you talk of silage in Quebec or the Maritimes but there are different attitudes, different details, and one of the big things is the type of expressions which are used; that is one of the major things. Our people around the rural areas have not the same educational facilities, as I expressed in the brief, as in the urban areas, and I do not think they will sit down with the dictionary at their elbow to understand the programme.

MR. COYNE: My confrere tells me that even the Quebec farmers object to some of the expressions being used.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question on these matters? It seems to me in this we are misunderstanding it. You are saying that the French farm programme, apart from its hour, is not understandable for New Brunswick, apparently, because of the way the thing is expressed -- apparently because of its content -- but later on you speak of the valuable CBC non-farm broadcasts which are in English. Now,

are they of a different character to the French farm broadcasts; are they in fact of a local nature? What is the distinction between the French on the one hand and the English on the other?

MR. ARSENAULT: As far as the Maritimes are concerned, for the French broadcasts we have the Le Réveil Rural every day except Saturday and Sunday and Sunday afternoons we have a programme about gardens and so forth,and another type of broadcast which is not necessarily rural is Le Choc des Idées. Now, the broadcast originates in Halifax; it is prepared for the Maritime farmers and it is prepared regionally by people who are familiar with the needs of the farmers in the Maritimes and at least they are on the spot to set out conditions and the needs of the people.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are the farm conditions so different in Quebec and the Maritimes that the content of a broadcast in Quebec would not be suitable to broadcast in the Maritimes?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, I would like to hear an agricultural man speak; I mean, this matter has been discussed by the French agricultural people in New Brunswick and they tell me basically they are the same but there is quite a bit of difference. For instance, it may be a minor point. You have large areas in Quebec where you have a lot of canneries and other facilities; in Quebec they have facilities for farmers to use these canneries, and if you go into the details you will find there are different factors which make farming in Quebec different from farming

here, although basically they would be the same.

MR. COYNE: On the English network the CBC programmes -- am I correct in thinking that the daily noonday programme is a regional programme that originates at the Halifax Studios and comes through CBA for the Maritime farmers?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Whereas the Farm Radio Forum is a national programme, and what you are really suggesting, if I understand you correctly, is that on the French network as far as CBAF Moncton is concerned, you will have some regional programmes more or less -- serving more or less the purpose that the present English broadcast serves over CBA?

MR. ARSENAULT: You are referring there to farm broadcasts only?

MR. COYNE: The daily noonday.

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is there any demand for any type of national farm programme in French over CBAF, say, roughly equivalent to the Farm Radio Forum?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes. First of all, I would like to say this, that I would not like to leave the impression that all of Le Réveil Rural could not be used in the Moncton area or New Brunswick. There again there are valuable broadcasts which could be probably edited and used. On this question which you have raised on a similar programme to Farm Radio Forum, it seems to me that it would be easy to give the farmers in New Brunswick something similar to the Farm Radio Forum. Farm Radio Forum in New Brunswick in some areas has developed quite a bit, and as secretary of the New Brunswick Federation of Agriculture I can say that in the areas where it has been developed quite a bit that the work of the Federation -- getting farmers to support it --has been made a lot easier. In French there is a programme prepared in Quebec, Le Choc des Idées, which can be compared to Farm Radio Forum with this exception, that Farm Radio Forum have facilities for following up their study group. The Farm Radio Forum on Monday night is worked generally through a group of neighbours who get together and discuss the broadcasts, and the secretary of the group prepares a report which is

forwarded, in our case, to Miss Marjorie Nicholson. Le Choc des Idées just gives the broadcast and does not follow it up, and it seems to me to assure the success of study clubs there must be a follow-up. We have found that where they did not follow it up with reports from our study club secretaries that there was a tendency for them to lose interest.

MR. COYNE: Is Farm Radio Forum followed at all in the French-speaking areas of New Brunswick?

MR. ARSENAULT: Practically not at all.

MR. COYNE: The Federation has not attempted to organize clubs?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, to replace that we have had clubs organized on a district basis. The Madawaska area has developed to such an extent they have appointed a permanent secretary for the area, and their study club has been going for three years now.

MR. COYNE: Following the Farm Radio Forum?

MR. ARSENAULT: No.

MR. COYNE: Quite distinct from that?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Could you tell us what stations in New Brunswick carry the Farm Market broadcasts and the Farm Radio Forum? You speak of coverage, particularly in the Upper Saint John Valley,not being adequate; do you know offhand which stations carry these programmes apart from CBA?

MR. ARSENAULT: I will not say for sure, but I have reason to believe that practically all

stations that are catering to rural areas carry these farm broadcasts. This point in the brief is from a resolution which was presented to our Federation at our annual meeting from the Carleton district of Federation of Agriculture, and this resolution was carried right through to the Canadian Federation and brought to the attention of the authorities, and I understand some improvement has been made adjacent to that area and further improvements are being considered.

MR. COYNE: At the bottom of page 4 you refer to the brief presented by the Maritime Federation of Agriculture in 1949, and the second result they say will flow from the maintenance and strengthening of the present system is "provide a check on present expanding commercialism of radio and a greater emphasis on the public interest." Does your Federation have any objection to advertising as such over the radio?

MR. ARSENAULT: Well, we understand that advertising is necessary. What we object to -- and I think the word there is "over-expanding" or "over-emphasis" or "abuse" of advertising, which in some cases actually happens.

MR. COYNE: You are not speaking specifically of advertising so much as commercialism or commercial control and that sort of thing?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, this referred more to advertising -- using the radio not as an educational basis but putting the emphasis more on the money making part of it rather than on the

educational or service part of radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you are not opposed to the notion that radio, and television too, may have a function to perform in increasing the sale of goods and services throughout Canada? You don't want to exclude that kind of service given by radio and television? You are not opposed to too much commercialism; is that a fair way to put it?

MR. ARSENAULT: Yes, sir.

MR. COYNE: In the next sentence you say:

> "Under the present system private stations have prospered and many also have provided community services which are of outstanding value."

I presume that there you are referring to services to the farming community?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Has your Federation given any consideration to the question of how the public broadcasting authority is to be financed, and specifically have you, among your executive or among your local groups, given any consideration to the question of a licence fee as a method of financing the CBC?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, I am afraid we haven't touched that question too much, because I think it involves some factors with which we are not familiar.

MR. COYNE: You are really not in a position to express views of the Federation on that?

MR. ARSENAULT: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: While on that page, I notice here on page 5 you say that in the United States under private operation of radio nearly all farm broadcasts have been pushed out of the desirable noon hour period by commercial programmes which are more lucrative, and then you say:

> "This was also the case at Moncton,when the local private station had a farm broadcast which until its demise had been assigned to the early morning period, from six to seven o'clock."

Do I take it from that that there had been a farm programme on the Moncton Station in the early morning and that that has now stopped?

MR. ARSENAULT: It did stop perhaps a year and a half ago. I don't know how long it was. It ran quite well, and it was from six to seven o'clock in the morning.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't know why it was stopped?

MR. ARSENAULT: No, I am not familiar with the reason.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I have asked you my questions as I went along. Thank you for coming, and we will consider your brief.

SUBMISSION OF
FREDERICTON COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Appearances:

Mr. Robert Rogers

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: This afternoon we have one other brief, and that is from the Fredericton Council of Churches; Reverend Dr. Elgee and Mr. Robert Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Elgee sends his regrets that he is unable to be here this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are Mr. Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will mark your brief as Exhibit No. 153, and will you present it, please?

EXHIBIT NO. 153: Brief of Fredericton Council of Churches.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: This presentation is made on behalf of the majority of churches in the City of Fredericton, New Brunswick, which is served by Radio Station CFNB, in Fredericton, and Television Station CHSJ-TV, near Saint John, both of which are privately owned.

We welcome this opportunity to commend these stations on the services they render to the religious life of the area, and express our appreciation for their presentation regularly of religious programmes on a sustaining basis. These include,

on radio, the Listening Post, daily; broadcasts of Sunday morning services direct from the churches; transcribed Bible readings in cooperation with the British and Foreign Bible Society; a Salvation Army programme and the Anglican Sunday School by radio.

From the CBC Trans-Canada network, two inspirational programmes are widely listened to. These are Eventide on Thursday night and Sunday Chorale. Perhaps I should add one that was omitted from the brief: "Religious Period" on Sunday afternoon, which is also widely listened to in this area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that CBC?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, that is CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is that called again?

MR. ROGERS: Religious Period, and it is heard locally at 3.30 p.m. on Sunday.

In television we commend the use of the Lutheran program This is the Life.

We wish to place on record our recognition of the importance of both radio and television as means of distributing religious knowledge and furthering the evangelistic appeal.

To this end,we feel that a widespread desire exists in the area to have the Church of the Air carried on both CBC English radio networks.

Where possible, we feel that the scheduling of programmes should be adjusted to suit the listening habits of audiences in the time zone where the programme is heard. Since there are six time zones in Canada, this may call for greater use of tape

recordings, which are now developed to a stage of technical excellence where the quality of reproduction leaves little to be desired.

We feel radio has done and is doing a great deal to make fine music available on a broad scale. Without delving into a discussion of tastes or preferences, we commend the stations for the time they devote to music by great composers, and fine music generally. It is our feeling that these programmes have wide appeal. Substantial audiences who do not readily indicate their preferences to the radio stations give this type of programme a standing often beyond its apparent popularity, particularly when the periods are short enough to maintain interest.

With respect to television, we join in the hope that technical advances will soon reach the point where religious services may be televised without detracting from the solemnity or dignity of worship.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Rogers, the religious programmes that you mentioned as being received on the CBC Trans-Canada network, those reach the audiences here through Station CFNB?

MR. ROGERS: That is correct.

MR. COYNE: Then you refer to the programme "Church of the Air", which you do not receive here, I take it?

MR. ROGERS: That is correct. That is a Dominion network programme which is carried and

received in other parts of the province, but is not available in this area.

MR. COYNE: Because you don't have a Dominion network outlet here?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

MR. COYNE: There is one in Saint John, I believe -- one of the two stations there?

MR. ROGERS: I believe that is correct. Many of us here find we do not receive the Saint John stations at all well.

MR. COYNE: You do receive the Saint John television station?

MR. ROGERS: We do, yes.

MR. COYNE: Better than you receive their radio stations?

MR. ROGERS: It would appear to be so. I think the Saint John television is a very powerful station.

MR. COYNE: Then you speak of the difficulties that time zones result in and the way in which that difficulty can be overcome by the greater use of tape: are there any specific problems that you have in mind there with reference to religious broadcasts?

MR. ROGERS: The Council did not mention a specific programme when the subject was discussed. I did wonder whether they might have had in mind the fact that "Eventide", for example, comes on at a very late hour here -- that is, for many people -- and possibly if it appeared an hour earlier it would

be more widely listened to.

MR. COYNE: Referring to the matter of "Church of the Air" for the moment, has your Council ever made any representations to CBC to try to obtain broadcasts of this programme here?

MR. ROGERS: I don't believe we have. It is a point that we probably shall be taking up some time.

MR. COYNE: Just one final question, with respect to television: do you really feel that it will be possible to televise actual church services from the churches?

MR. ROGERS: We are hoping that possibly in time it may be. Are they doing that now in other parts of Canada?

MR. COYNE: I don't know. My associate says they are doing it in Montreal. I didn't know that.

MR. ROGERS: I see.

MR. COYNE: But you don't see any reason why, with appropriate production techniques, it should not be used?

MR. ROGERS: That is our feeling. We were hoping that the cameras and so forth in time to come might be in a reasonably unobtrusive position, and if the production techniques were improved we would have no objection in principle to televising religious services.

MR. COYNE: What advantage would there be to having religious services televised as distinct from broadcast over the radio? I mean, people have

radios, and they may also have television sets, but why do you think it would be desirable? Do you think the religious service is more adequately portrayed over television, or could be, than it is over radio?

MR. ROGERS: I think it might depend on the type of service being broadcast. I could imagine that some of the more liturgical services might become more vital and full of life on television than would be the case on radio, particularly the type of service in which movement and that sort of thing plays some part.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there is a great extra cost involved, of course, in television, and I think one thing we have to have in mind in this kind of point is whether the improvement in the television medium is great enough to justify the extra cost.

MR. ROGERS: Surely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because actually at the present time the religious broadcast by radio is, you think, a valuable and effective thing as it is?

MR. ROGERS: Very much so. I think there was the feeling that there may be those who would be watching television who might not be listening as much to radio, and that they should not be deprived of the opportunity to have some form of religious worship in the new medium.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, I would think most people who have a television set would also have a radio set. It is a matter of turning a few buttons.

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In the course of our wanderings around the country we have heard on two or three occasions objection taken to one of the regulations of the CBC, which reads, "except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than churches or religious bodies permanently established in Canada and serving the area covered by the station . . .": have you any thoughts that you would care to express on that one point?

MR. ROGERS: The subject did not come up at any discussion in the Council of Churches, and so I am not able to answer officially on it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Other than to say ---

MR. ROGERS: There was no objection raised at any meeting of the Council on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have one or two questions and they are mostly for the sake of the record itself. You, yourself, in Dr. Elgee's absence, are presenting the brief; are you, yourself, a member of the Fredericton Council of Churches?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, I am the secretary of the Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are in one of the religious denominations?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I notice there was a Brief committee: was that specially appointed for the purpose of submitting this brief? Let me explain what

I am asking: I think this is the first time we have had the privilege of a brief being presented by the local Council of Churches, and I want to know how you came to present it. Did you do it of your own volition, or were you asked to do it, or what?

MR. ROGERS: The subject was first raised in the executive of the Council, and our committee was appointed to prepare a draft of a brief, which then was submitted to a full meeting of Council, and the Council approved the brief at that meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the initiation? Did this come from some member of the Council? How did it start? This is radio, which is somewhat out of the normal course of activity of a local Council of Churches, and I wondered how you came to decide to put in a brief?

MR. ROGERS: It came from within the executive in the first place -- from a member of the executive who was interested in the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I see. As you realize, this is on a very important but rather narrow point, so we haven't had a great many questions to ask you, but we appreciate you coming. Thank you.

MR. ROGERS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes our list for today. We have six or eight briefs to hear tomorrow, and we will start at 10.00 a.m. I think the first on the list is the Provincial Council of Women, followed by the United Nations Association,

Fredericton Branch, and a number of others after that. We will adjourn now until ten o'clock in the morning.

- - - -

---The hearing adjourned at 4.50 p.m. to resume at 10.00 a.m., Wednesday, June 26th, 1956.

- - - -

HAND BOUND
BY
UNIVERSITY
OF TORONTO
PRESS